

Catholick Communion

Doubly Defended:

By Dr. OWENS VINDICATOR.

AND

RICHARD BAXTER.

And the State of that Communion opened, and the Questions discussed, whether there be any Displeasure at Sin, or Repentance for it in Heaven.

With a Parallel of the case of using a faulty Translation of Scripture, and a faulty Liturgy.

Gal. 2. 11, 12, 13. When Peter was come to Antioch, I withdrew him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them which were of the Circumcision: And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him, insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation.

Acts 11. 2, 3. They which were of the Circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumised, and didst eat with them.

Jud. 10. These speak evil of those things which they know not.

LONDON, Printed for Thomas Parkurst at the Three Bibles and Crown, at the lower end of Cheapside, near Mercers-Chappel. 1684.

VI. I. 1.

2. 3. 4.

THAT the Primitive Churches had some Responsal Forms (which our Psalms in Meeter, and Tune, do now supply without offence or disorder) and that it is the declining of Zeal, and the badnes of men, that is become their disgrace, and not the forms; for the use of men of both extreems (passing by Cyprians *Surgsum Corda*) I shall recite an evidence out of *Chrysostom*, on 1 Cor. 14. pag. 652. *When we begin to say—* the People answer [with thy Spirit,] shewing that they so speake of old; not moved by their own *Wisdoms*, but by the *Spirit*. But I speak not now of my self: But the Church is now like a Woman, which is fallen from her ancient prosperity; and in many places retaineth only the Symbols (or tokens) of that ancient felicity; and sheweth only the Cases (or Boxes) and Cabinets (or Tills) of her Jewels (or Ornaments,) but is deprived of her Riches. The Church is now like such a Woman. And I speak not this only as to (her loss of) gifts; (for if this were all, the matter were the less,) but also as to Life and Virtue. When in the fourth Century the old Custom is thus reported, it must be very ancient: And this sheweth that Zeal then caused the peoples Responses; And were they now used by good men with the like holy Zeal, they would be less scrupled.

A 2 THE

THE CONTENTS.

S E C T . 1.

THE *Vindicators* healing Concessions and Silence.

S E C T . 2.

What Catholick Communion is, which I plead for in 40 Positions.

S E C T . 3.

Our Doctrinal Differences.

- I. *What knowledge Souls in Heaven have.*
- II. *Whether those in Heaven (yea, God) be not displeased with sin.* Aff.
- III. *Whether there be no repentance in Heaven.* Aff.
- IV. *Whether it be true that doing what a Law requireth so far as the intention is moved by the Law, is a justifying of it, and that submitting to any Law on consideration of its Penalties, is so far to justify the Preceptive part, and not so great an Evil as the Penal.* Neg.

S E C T . 4

Short strictures on his words for the use of the Vindicator.

S E C T . 5.

A Parallel, or Comparison of the Case of using a faulty Translation of Gods Word (as Christ and the Apostles did the Septuagint) with that of using a faulty Liturgy.

S E C T . 6.

An Expository Advertisement about naming Men.

The

to the first of your Letters to consider your objection which
 you have made to my Argument concerning the Lawfulness of
 the Common Prayer.

The Consent of Dr. Owens Vindicator to the Catholick Communion, de- fended by Richard Baxter.

S E C T. I.

SIR, Your Book called, *A Vindication of Dr. Owen*, I find containeth four distinct Parts or Subjects.

I. A Vindication of Dr. Owens Personal Worth : which you and I agreeing in, I have nothing in that to say against you.

II. Your Consent to the main of the Cause which I defend, and your dissent from the Persons whose words I Confute : Of this I shall thankfully take notice.

III. Your blaming of me for my naming the Dr. and for my manner of defence against his Arguments.

IV. Your dissent from me in certain Doctrinals.

Having dismiss'd the first, as to the second, I thank you,

1. That you profess your self a hearty friend to all good men, and to the unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace.

2. I thank you that you say, p. 3. [*I do not pretend in what follows to maintain against you that it is unlawful to use a form of Prayer, or comply with an imposed Liturgy, or under some circumstances to joyn in the use of ours in Worship.*] Neither shall I undertake to justify altogether the 12 Arguments you have printed as Dr. Owens, in order to refuting them.

3. I am pleased that you expound the Doctors words, p. 24. as signifying only, [*It is not lawful for us to go and joyn in publick Worship by the Common-Prayer.*] He doth not say it is not lawful for any : and for ought you know this [Us] whom be concerned in it, might be a very few to whom this Manuscript was imparted, and they might be under such circumstances as your own resolutions oft in Print would discharge from that Worship as a duty.]

Were I never so well able to prove from this, and the Doctors many printed Writings, that he meant more, I would not now do it. I only here desire the Men and Women that have been with me, and profess that they thought the Doctors 12 Arguments to be unanswerable against

tha

the Lawfulness of joyning in the use of the Lyturgy, to take notice of what his worthy Vindicator saith.

4. You grant, p. 25. that you ["Conceive that the Author doth not mean by these words, [Because that Worship itself-- is not lawful] that it is simply unlawful, which must render it so at all times, and to all Persons, under what circumstances soever: But that taken with all its modes, as well as matter, and the manner, severity, and universality of its imposing, it is so: Besides, it is not said that according to the rule of the Gospel it is Unlawful, but [according to the rule of the Gospel it is not lawful, [which may fairly be construed thus; The rule of the Gospel doth not authenticate, or warrant it; and I think it ought to be so construed: It being the defect of the rule, not its Opposition, which he lays the great strels of his Cause upon.

Remember Reader, that I was mistaken that thought *not-lawful*, and *unlawful* had been all one, and that the Doctor said not that the joyning in the Lyturgy as aforesaid, was *unlawful*, but only *not lawful*, not as in opposition to the rule, but *wi: bous* it, (and so are the 20 circumstances which I named.]

5. When he saith [*It is not in our power to make use of any part of it as we shall think fit.*] And I maintain that though man hath not put that in our power, God hath put it in our power to joyn in the good part of tolerable Publick Worship, without owning the faults (or else we must joyn with none;) you deny not this, p. 27. but say that he meant it of mans giving us power (which I never denied.) But it is God that we serve.

You say ["When men pray, they bid us pray--in extempore prayer, both are required to what is good.] True: And I may joyn with the good in an extempore prayer, without owning any evil in it.

Indeed you say, p. 28. ["The Mass is not more twisted in all the parts of it by Law, than the Lyturgy, nor left less to our power to pick and choose: If this Union do render the far greater pollutions, the Idolatry, and Heresy of the Mass infectious to the whole Worship, who can prove that the pollutions of other Worship, when we are likewise commanded not to distinguish or divide, doth not in their kind and degree diffuse the taint alike.]

Ansf. God is the Master of his Worship: I do what he bids me, tho man contradict it: If God bid me hear and believe the Scripture, and man say, hear also, and believe the Apocrypha, I will openly profess I obey God, and you, no further than you contradict not God: Rather than not hear the Scripture, I will hear also the Apocrypha, but not believe it to be Gods Word. But if they bid me also hear the Alcoran, I will withdraw. 2. It is not the *Conjunction*, but the *kind of the thing* joyned that maketh it unlawful: An honest weak man, an Antinomian,

an Anabaptist, a Presbyterian, or whoever you dissent from in tolerable cases, may mix his Opinion, and faulty expressions and methods, with his Prayer and Sermon, as intimately as evil is mixt in the Mafs, and yet you will not refuse Communion with him : It is lawful to drink beer that hath bad water mixt, rather than none, but not to drink that which hath poysen equally mixt.

To p. 29. I think if a Turk pray against Idolatry, Murder, &c. that Prayer is materially good : But as to *Goodness* from a *Holy Principle*, no Hypocrites is good. The insufficiency of my answer you no way manifest, till you prove that I must joyn with all that is in publick Worship, or with none.

6. Pag. 32. You say [“Doth he say a word of owning Parish Churches, and Worship.”] Ans. If you or he say nothing against these, we shall leave the Diocesan case to others : But if you be the man that I have lately privately written to, I doubt not but I have proved to you, that Parish Churches that have good Ministers, are true particular Churches, and those Ministers true Pastors, and that any Bishops holding the contrary, doth not disprove it.

7. When you recite my words, describing the Cause I plead, viz. [I have written over and over, that I persuade no man either to, or from a publick Church, till I know his Circumstances; And that I doubt not but it is one mans duty, and another mans sin.] You add [“I believe dear Sir, that though this concession may displease those who may best bear it, it may reconcile you to most of those that are called Dissenters.”]

If so, those Dissenters it seems by you do not much differ from me : But I think ten to one of the people accounted commonly Dissenters through England, are of my mind, and are for Parish-Worship rather than either none or worse. But by *Dissenters*, I suppose you mean those of the Doctors mind, or your own : And if so, I thank you for your own Charity and Reconciliation : But if you did not know them better than I, I should doubt that your said Friends are not altogether so reconcileable.

Sir, You add, p. 39. [“And if (as you allow) the practical determination depends on the circumstances of the Persons, you reduce the Controversy to a far narrower room, than was by most supposed: And every one being best capable of understanding his own circumstances, it will not bear great heat or importunity from another.”]

But whence came those wrong Suppositions of the most? If after 20 years Communion in the Parish Churches, I venture on the Censurous so far as to give my Reasons for my own Practice, and defend those Reasons, and that Practice against contrary Writings, and such wise Men as you are so reconcilable, and see how narrow the Controversy is, whence comes it that most think it to be what it is not, against such frequent

quent plain expressions? You and I may conjecture at the Cause. Your Conclusion is a pious Profession of that Love, and the main Principles of that Concord for which I write.

10. You wifely leave the Vindication of the Doctors words, when it cometh to the case which I oppose him in: As ["That neither God, " nor good men will allow of, judging our Profession and Practice by "any reserves of our own;] when I have proved that our reserves against owning mixtures of evil, are necessary in all Communion.

11. You vindicate not his words, that ["He that joyns in the Worship of the Common-Prayer, doth by his Practice make Profession " that it is *wholly agreeable to Gods mind and will*. And that to do it with "other reserves is Hypocrify, and worse than the thing itself, with- "out them.

12. You vindicate not his grand Argument ["Religious Worship not " Divinely Instituted and Appointed, is false Worship,] without excepting any secondary sort of Worship.

13. You defend not his saying ["That there is nothing accidental in " the Worship of God: and that every thing that belongs to it is part of it, or " of its subsistence.]

13. You defend not that, ["Because outward Rites and Modes of Worship " Divinely Instituted and determined, do become necessary parts of " Divine Worship, therefore such as are Humanly Instituted and De- " termined, are thereby made parts of false Worship.] What work would this Argument make? If all outward Modes are false Worship, when determined by Men, if Divine Determination would make them necessary.

14. You do not vindicate that ["All Prayers and Praise in Church- " Assemblies, meerly as such, are prohibited by the Lyurgy,] unless you do it by denying Parish-Churches.

15. You do not defend ["That the Lyurgick Worship was in its " first Contrivance, and is in its continuance, an Invention, or Engine to " defeat, or render useles the promise of Christ to his Church, of sen- " ding the Spirit in all Ages to enable it to the due discharge, and per- " formance of all Divine Worship in its Assemblies, and therefore un- " lawful to be complyed with. That the very being and continuance of the " Church, without which it is but a dead Machine, lyeth on this.

Doth this speak only of the English Lyurgy, which is not 200 years old, think you? When next he tells us, that ["It's the way of Worship " by a prescribed Lyurgy, and that it was insensibly brought in (when "in several Ages the Church had lived without it) and that to render "the promise of Christ, and the work of the Holy Ghost in the Adminstration of gifts useles.

16. You defend not that ["Hence followed a total neglect of all the Spirits Gifts in the said Administration--- Nor that [This produced all the Enmity--- of the said work of the Spirit, which the world is now filled withal--- that it ariseth from hence alone. Nor that the Worship Treated about, consists wholly in the Institutions, and on the Authority of Men, and therefore is false Worship--- and to renounce the Kingly Office of Christ in the Church.

Nor that ["It belongs to the faithfulness of Christ to appoint and command all things in the Church that belong to the Worship of God---in the Forms and Modes of them--- (Doth this speak only of the English Lyturgy.)

"Nor that liberty to use gifts in Prayer and Preaching, is ridiculously pretended, & they are excluded in all the solemn Worship of the Church.

17. You defend not that ["This Practice (joyning in the Lyturgy) condemns the suffering Saints of the present Age, readers them false Witnesses of God, and the only blameable cause of their own sufferings.] And if all the Nonconformists that 1660 gave their Testimony for a Reformed Lyturgy, were not Saints, at least they have been Sufferers: And doth not this as much make them false Witnesses? And if both you and we were mistaken, I am confident you will not justify all that we suffer by, and say we are the only blameable Cause? As if every such mistake were worthy of all the punishment undergone? Nor will you think that every good Mans Opinion must be justified, which he suffereth for, lest he be made the only Cause.

18. You defend not that ["All the Promises, Aids of the Holy Spirit, with respect to the Prayer of the Church, whether as to the matter of them, or ability---or the manner---are rejected and excluded by this Form of Worship.]

19. " You defend not, I hope, that your Church Covenant is to observe---nothing but what Christ commandeth in the Worship of God.

20. Nor that ["The Practice inquired into contains a virtual renunciation of our Church State, and of the lawfulness of our Ministry, and Ordinances therein.] If you do, it is no renunciation of ours.

I thank you that you defend none of all these. For truly they be not things Indifferent, but if they be not true, they are of confounding, dividing, unpeaceable Consequence.

S E C T. 2.

III. **A**S to the third thing, which taketh up most room, viz. your blaming me, 1. For using the Doctors name, 2. For the manner of my Confutation, I say distinctly,

1. I confess I think that the name of Christ and Religion, and its Honour is to be preferred before all mens : And I had many years ago heard a Conformable Preacher before a very honourable, and learned Auditory, charge the Nonconformists with holding that [*A thing lawful in itself, in Gods Worship, becometh unlawful, if it be commanded by the Magistrate. And that Forms and Liturgies were unlawful, because they be not made in Scripture by Christ.*] And I have read too many such Charges : And I always answered that we were flandered.

2. I quickly heard that the Manuscript was commonly spread, and he that brought it me, said, he believed a thousand were confirmed by it against going to the Parish Churches and Lyurgy.

3. Several of my Friends and Acquaintance had got it, and told me they thought it unanswerable. And all named the Doctor as the Author.

4. I was suddenly told of a very able Conformist that was going to answer it, and I feared he would lay it on us all.

5. I made no doubt but Pulpits and Preses would loudly say, these are the Nonconformists Principles : and if I denied it would cite the Doctors Paper and Name.

6. I knew divers of his Printed Books have the same Opinion of the unlawfulness of Imposed Forms ; what now should I say against such reporters of the Nonconformists Opinions ? Must we all bear the Accusation of so many Errors, and be published with Scorn and Contempt to be such, to make us odious to all, rather than one Man should be Confuted.

I purposed at first to conceal his Name, till I saw that all took notice of it, and none denied it, (and after (I conjecture it is your self) that in the Letter to me affirmed it.) I know that multitudes of Men of Name, Learning, and Power, scorn us as they do the Quakers, as believing them that say [*We make all this noise and Schism as a distinct Party, and suffer silencing, and Imprisonment, because we will not Communicate with the Lyurgy which the Martyrs owned :*] I dare not suffer the Innocent to lie under such a flander for one [or many] Mans Name ; we gave them our publick Testimony to the contrary, 1660. and 1661. If a few that would not come in then, and be seen among them that pleaded the Cause of the old Nonconformists, have now by our distempers got so many of their mind as that we must be thought intolerably to wrong them, if we (necessarily) give our reasons against them, and shall pass their Excommunicating Sentence against the Cause of the old Non-Conformists, and yours, I cannot be one that shall betray the Truth and Cause of Catholick Communion by silence at such a time, when the Erroneous expect that their Opinion should be so necessary to our Union, that none must contradict it.

There

Therefore your saying that you have met with none that approveth my writing, if it were for the Cause, as well as my faultines, will make me see the greater necessity of bearing my Testimony against them; Epidemical diseases most need Physicians; it not to cure the sick, yet to preserve the sound. Paul wanted not Love nor Prudence so ~~easy~~, when he not only reproved his Temporizing Separation to his Face, but left it with his Name on Record to all Generations, when they were both dead. Christ had immediately before abundantly honoured, and praised Peter, who yet for his miscarriage speaketh to him, as he did to the Devil, *Get thee behind me Satan, &c. Mat. 16.* And yet the miscarriage was done in Love to Christ, by a prime and dear Disciple; and his name must be thus left under this most sharp reproof, to be read from Age to Age by all. James and John were choice Disciples, and yet their Ambition, and their Uncharitable Zeal for Christ, must be recorded with their Names, as men that desired they knew not what, and knew not what manner of Spirit they were of. We are not so much better than they, as the Passions of some Applauders intimate: Christ will not be more tender of our Names, than of his Cause, and the good of Souls. If David will cause Gods Enemies to blaspheme, his sin shall be punished in the sight of the Sun, though the sharpest part of the punishment be pardoned.

But as for my naming the Dr. and your intimation, that it's long of me that he is named as the Author of those Arguments, I further say, 1. Is not a Man named openly, till his Name be Printed? Was not the uncontradicted report, (still continued) a publication. Was there no publication of Names till 2 or 3 years ago, when Printing was invented? 2. All that I yet desire, is to be able to deny it to be his, that the next Man that hits the Non-Conformists in the Teeth with it, as the Doctors, may but be told it is not his: If you can and will but tell me that you believe it not to be his, that I may have but so much to say, I will thank you, and make it publickly known.

Either the Cause and Arguments are true, or false: If true, defend them. If false, are they not dangerous in so great a Cause, and at such a time, when they tend to drive hundred thousands from all Church Worship and Communion, and to persuade Men into scandalous suffering for ill doing.

I think it laudable in you to honour the Doctor, and if you be the Man I conjecture you are, I think it's specially incumbent on you; As to your hints of suspicion of my sense of old differences, if I know my heart, I forgave, and fully put up all Personal Quarrell long ago: But the National Concerns made so deep a wound in my heart, as never will be fully healed in this world: But this leads me to the second part of your reproof.

II. I do but tell you my reasons for naming the Doctor, but I undertake not to justify either that, or the manner of my writing, from mistake, imprudence, or other such faultiness: I suppose you to be a Man whom I take from my heart to be far wiser, and better than my self: And therefore, as I thank you for your gentle, friendly reprehension, so I profess that my very esteem and reverence of your judgment maketh me suspect that I have done amiss, when I see it not in the Cause itself: That I could have defended the Cause of Love and Communion against those Arguments, without taking notice of the Author, and without wronging the Non-conformists who will be charged by his name I did, and do wish; but I thought it could not well be done. If in this I mistook, I ask pardon of God and Man; for so I must do for my sins known and unknown.

And as to the manner of my writing again, I say, I am convinced that all that I do is faulty, and cannot but have some favour of the ignorance, and imprudence, and forgetfulness, and other faults of the Author. I read over your Animadversions, and, 1. I see at present some words of my own, that I much more blame my self for writing, than you for blaming. 2. What I yet see not to be faulty, your Authority shall make me yet suspect, and further consider. 3. I see very many passages, where I am confident the mistake is yours, sometimes mistaking the matter, and sometime my words. What good will it do the Reader, or you, or me, to give the world an account of all these, and to drown the Cause in abundance of *self-defending words*? Indeed I have neither time nor mind to write a Book now for my self-defence. The greatest Affliction I have by this Controversy as Personal, is this diverting of my thoughts so near my last hours from things more agreeable to my Case: And far be it from me to be confident in justifying my (faulty) writings, when I am going to the Judge that will take that for an aggravation of my sin. But I durst never forsake publick Communion, nor my own work, because I cannot have one, and do the other without fault: I am suspicious there may be more faults in me and my writings, than either I discern, or you, or any such have told me of. And if I could prove that your mistakes are the ground of your Accusation, I see by your noting my numbering the mistakes in matter of Fact, in the private Letter to me, how you would take it.

Therefore, instead of writing for my self, I will give the Reader this concession and advice.

Readers, I think it is little of thy concern to know whether I be wise or unwise, good or bad, or whether I did well or ill in naming Dr. O. or whether the manner of my writing be much, or little to be blamed: On condition you will agree with me in the cause of Love and Concord that I defend, I only then intreat you, that what imprudence, unskil fulness, rashness, or other

other faults you find in me or my writings, you will the more carefully your selves avoid them, and do better; And if you judge me to do ill, when I do my duty, and think very hardly of me for being against your way, I unspeignedly forgive you; and if you forgive not me, I can bear that. I was aware that I should be ill spoken of by many whom I love: And I am not Ambitious to be ill spoken of: If Folly make me exercise self-denial, it is for somewhat that I thought had been better then all the Love and Praises which I deny. I flatter no Party, and I look to gain by none: I have gathered no Church to depend on for kindness, nor is the fear of displeasing them a byas to my judgment. And if it be otherwise with any, I think, were they like to have need of men in this world as short a time as I, they would make as little of mens good or ill thoughts and words as I do, except for the sake of other men.

Therefore Reader, think of all the rest what you see cause, so you will but agree in the Cause that I am defending: That is,

I. *That GOD IS LOVE, and he that dwelleth in LOVE dwelleth in GOD, and GOD in him, 1 Joh. 4.*

II. *It is the Prayer of Christ that all who shall believe may be one, that the world may thereby be brought to believe that the Father sent him, Jo. 17. 21, 22, 23: And that they must love one another, even as he hath loved them, by which it is that all must know that they are his Disciples, Jo. 13. 34, 35.*

III. *This Love must extend to all that are of one Body, one Spirit, one Hope, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all: And this Unity of the Spirit must be kept in the bond of Peace, Eph. 4. 3. And if it be possible, as much as in us lyeth, we must live peaceably with all men, Rom. 12. 18.*

IV. *Christians must love one another with a pure heart, fervently, 1 Pet. 1. 22. with a Love which suffereth long, and is kind, enviieth not, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, beareth all things, believeth, hopeth, endureth all things, Rom. 13.*

V. *Yet must they not be so tender of each others Honour, as of Gods, nor justify the sin of any, nor make mens names a snare to draw the weak to sin, nor think that Love and Peace can be justly vindicated without gain-saying the Errours which oppose them, nor that Christ broke the Law of Love by his sharp rebuke of Peter, that tempted him to forbear the work of Love,; nor by rebuking the hurtful zeal of James and John, nor by being angry with those that forbad little Children to come to him; nor Paul by mistaking Peter in his Separation.*

VI. *Christian Love must extend to those that differ from us, though faultily in Cases of tolerable infirmity, so as not to judge or despise them, but to receive them to our Communion, as Christ receiveth us, Rom. 14 & 15. Approving all so far, that serve God in that which his Kingdom doth consist in, Rom. 14. 17, 18.*

VI. All Christians must earnestly oppose Divisions, and Sects, and sidlings with Strife and Envy as a sign of Carnal Men, and must labour to be perfectly joised together in the same mind and judgment, and to glorify God with one mind and mouth, 1 Cor. 1. 10. &c 3. 3, &c. And must not forsake the assembling of themselves, Heb. 10. 25.

VII. It is by Love that the whole Body of Christ must edify itself, and win, and overcome their Adversaries, even those that curse, and hate, and persecute them, as God doth good to the just and unjust, Love being the most powerful Conquerour of Hearts, Eph. 4. 15, 16. Matth. 5. 44, &c.

VIII. No excellency of one Party above others, nor no faultiness of any Christians, must be pretended against any duty of Love and Communion; But we must not sin for Communion with any.

IX. Though we must not by profession, word, or subscription own the sin of any Church, we must join in their Communion in the Worship of God, with those whose Worship is mixt with sin in matter and manner, so it be not sin that is by its evil predominant against the good of the duty, to make the work rejected of God (like Poysen in our food, which makes the hurt greater than the good) because else we must neither Worship God our selves, nor join with any in the world: All the works of sinful men being mixt with sin. To deny this, is virtually to separate from all the Christian world.

X. Therefore our bare presence is no signification that we approve all that is done in that Assembly. The very nature of Christian Communion is a profession of the contrary; we being bound by God to communicate in good, and not to own the evil: And if men command us to own all that they there do, their command cannot bind us against Gods, nor make our presence a profession that we obey them against God: It being God that is the Master of us, and our work. And Christianity itself being a profession that we obey God before Man. Else Man by commanding us to own some ill word, or circumstance, might drive us from all Christian Communion. If Men should command us in our private Meetings, to do it for an ill end, or an ill Principle (as in Obedience to Usurpers) we must not therefore forbear all private Meetings, nor will our bare meeting signify our Obedience to such Commands. If the Pastor of a single Church (or many Associate) tell the people, your meeting must be to own e. g. Anabaptistry, Antinomanism, Presbytery, Erastianism, Separation, &c. this binds them not either to own it, or to withdraw, without some greater reason. He is no Master of their Faith.

XI. Nor will the bare knowing beforehand that the Pastor will say or do somewhat unlawful, make our presence guilty of approving it. We know beforehand that we and all Men are sinners, and shall sin in what we do: And we may suppose Men will speak as they think: And as we know not but any Man may speak amiss, till we hear what he saith, so when we know that the Pastors have tolerable Errors, and will vent them, it will not make us guilty of their sin, nor bind us to depart: We meet to own Christianity, and not all that the Man will say

say or do (known or unknown) I know before that I shall have many faults in my own Prayer (disorder, dulness, &c.) which I do not own, though herein I am guilty.

XII. Yet no Man should prefer worse before better, if all things set together, it be better indeed to the Person at that time.

XIII. God hath by his Son Jesus, and his Apostles, instituted all that in Doctrine, Discipline, Worship, and Conversation, which is obligatory, or necessary Universally to all the Church, over and above, what is required by the Law of Nature. And no Man or Men have power to add anything of universal obligation.

XIV. God hath by Nature and Scripture obliged Men themselves to choose and determine divers subordinate expressions, significations, modes, circumstances, or accidents of this universal Religion, which are not themselves meet for an universal, and unchangeable, obligation, but local, temporary, and miserable: Some of which every Man may choose for himself, some the present Pastor must choose, some the associated Pastors may choose, and some the Magistrate may choose. These must be added to the universal Duties, so far is such addition from being sin: I have often named many particulars; As the Translation of the Scripture, which to choose: The version of the Psalms in rhyme, or metre, the common use of new made Hymns, the dividing the Scripture into Chapter and Verse; the words of Sermons; their method; the particular Text to be chosen; what Chapters to read; at what hour to begin; how long to Preach; in what words to pray, whether the same oft, or changed; whether fore-studied, or not, whether written, or unwritten; whether studied, and written by our selves, or by others; where the place shall be, where the Pulpit, Font, Table, &c. shall stand; what Ornaments they shall have, Linnen, Silk, silver Vessels or otherwise? Whether we be bare-headed, or covered at Prayer, Sacrament, &c. Whether we shall kneel, stand, sit, or be prostrate at Prayer, &c. what distinctive Garments Pastors shall use. By what signs of consent and obligation Men vow, and swear, whether by putting the hand under the Thigh, lifting it up, subscribing, laying it on the Book, kissing the Book, &c. what Catechisms to use, with many more such. God hath commanded men to choose such things as these by the Rules of Edification, Love, Peace, Concord, Order, Decency, warning those without, &c.

XV. These may be called Worship in a sense subservient to Gods Ordinances of Worship (as we Worship Men, by putting off the Hat, kneeling, bowing, &c.) But if any will not call it Worship, they must not call it false Worship, nor pretend that the Controversy is any more than about the bare name.

XVI. They that feign such things as these to be sinful additions, and an invading of Christs Office, and denying his faithfulness, &c. condemn the Scripture that commandeth such determinations, and contradict the Law of Nature, and the practice of all Churches on Earth, and would extirpate all Gods Worship, which cannot be performed without some such determinations.

XVII. As

XVII. As God hath not tied us to words in Prayer or Preaching (though he have recorded many forms in Scripture) but left all to choose what words, time and circumstances make fit (by Book, or without,) so the conveniences, and inconveniences both of set forms, and of free speaking, are on each part so great and undeniable, that we have no cause to censure that Church which useth both; that is, which agreeeth on a set form, to shew what the Church professeth to own, if the Minister should blurt out any Errour or Undecency, and yet not restrain Ministers from the due use of free speech.

XVIII. It is a great sin out of a fond Conceit of the excellency of either way, above it's due value, to think & speak with unjust vilifying of the other way, when God hath tied us to neither alone: It is contrary to knowledge, love, peace, and concord, out of a self-conceitedness, peevishnes, or false prejudice received from others, to think, and speak worse of other mens words in Prayer, than they deserve: and to frighten the ignorant from lawful Communion, by calling that sin, or false Worship, that is not so.

XIX. Not meddling with Ministers Subscribing, Declaring, Swearing, nor with the Discipline, By-offices, Baptizing as by our sort of Godfathers Covenanting without the Parents, Crossing, and undue application of words at Burial, and such like; I know nothing in the common Lords-day Worship spoken in the name of the Church, which a godly Christian may not joyn in, with the exercise of the Spirit of Prayer with faith and comfort; if prejudice, and false apprehensions of it, affright him not, or put not his Soul out of relish with it. (As on the other side prejudice distracteth many too much with the faulty methods and words of many mens extempore Prayers.)

XX. There are so few Churches on Earth that Worship God without all set Liturgies or Forms as are next to none. And there are very few in all the World so good as the English Liturgy, and that have so few faults: Which Martyrs composed, and joyfully used. And it is unchristian to renounce Communion with any one Church, for a reason that is common to all, or almost all. It being contrary to the Communion of Saints in one body, and far worse than to slander any single man.

XXI. It is great self-condemnation in them that cannot bear to be censured, nor scarce be contradicted, yet thus to censure almost all the Church.

XXII. They that think that Conforming Ministers are guilty of great Sin, must consider what diversity of Education, Company, and Interest may do, even on men of Conscience, and that we have all our sins. And it's sinful uncharitablenes to think, and speak worse of them than they deserve, and to talk against all, for the faults of some.

XXIII. So great is Gods mercy to this Land, in yet giving many Godly able Ministers to the publick Churches, that it is sinful ingratitude to overlook or deny it, though many others be never so bad.

XXIV. The Religion that keepeth possession of the Parish Churches will be the National Religion: Mourn therefore before God, that ever any men professing

fessing Godliness, should either labour to get all sound Protestants to desert the Parish Churches, or that any such have been against the restoring of Nonconformists, by that called a Comprehension, which was but the withdrawing of such Impositions as these very men thought sinful; and all this, lest it should diminish the number and strength of the private Churches. By this we see what we are doing against our selves, if God save us not.

XXV. They that say Conformists Convert no Souls, take on them to know that of thousands which they know not: and forget that before 1640, there were few but Conformists to Convert them in the land, and that all the Westminster Assembly, save eight, were such. And that the Parliament kept near 7000 in the Ministry, that all Conformed on Aug. 24. 1662.

XXVI. In most Counties of England, many hundred Persons to one must have Church Communion in the Parish Churches, or have none at all: And to renounce all Church Worship and Communion, rather than joyn in the Parish Churches, and with the Liturgy, and to persuade all to do so, is almost to draw the Land to live like Atheists: And is so pernicious to Souls, that no good Christian should favour it. And it is a gross breach of the Covenant, which renounceth Prophaneness, Schism, and all that is contrary to godliness.

XXVII. So much are Papists angry at Protestant Ministers that keep them out of the Parish Churches, reviling them as Trimmers, supposing that Conventicles can do them less harm, that all that love the Protestant Religion, should do their best to encourage all such Orthodox Men, and to strengthen the Protestant interest in the Parish Churches, and not joyn against them with the Papists, however it be with other intents and minds.

XXVIII. So great is the peace and comfort of many Parishes, where the publick Ministers, and all the Religious People live together in Love and Amity, that it loudly tells us how much better that is, than to study to render each other odious, or vile, and excommunicable.

XXIX. Such use of godly publick Ministers may well stand with the best improvement we can make of the private help of others.

XXX. If we would win any that we think worst of, yea, or ease our selves, it must be by love to them, and not by condemning them on controvertible accounts, or by causeless singularities.

XXXI. It is lawful to have transient Communion with an occasional Assembly of Christians that are no fixed Church, nor the Minister the fixed Pastor of any particular Church.

XXXII. It is lawful to have transient Communion with a Church of Strangers or Neighbours, without taking an account of the calling of their Pastors, or of their Discipline.

XXXIII. When we have right to Gods Ordinances, if many intrude that have no right, when we cannot hinder it, we must not therefore forsake our right, or Gods Worship.

XXXIV. Though we must prefer better before worse, that worse may be best

to us at that time and place, when we cannot have better without more hurt than benefit to the publick, or our selves. Among many Ministers, weak and strong, all cannot bear the best, nor must renounce the weaker. To live under the countenance of Government under an honest Minister of mean Parts in Peace and Concord, though he use the Liturgy, is more to the common advantage of Religion, and to the profit of most particidar Souls, than to bear an abler Man, with the distraction of Disturbers, and to be Fined, and lie in Prison or no better a Cause.

XXXV. It is not only the Law of Man that maketh the foresaid Parish Communion a Duty, but it is Gods Law of Love, Concord, Peace, and Universal Communion, if there were no constraining Law of Man.

XXXVI. They that constantly refuse Communion in the publick Churches while it is commanded, and while many write to prove it sinful, and many are in Prison, and ruined for refusing it, are justly to be interpreted to hold it to be unlawful, unless they openly profess the contrary, and give some better reason for their forbearance.

XXXVII. To hold that any Congregations are such, whose Worship is faulty, but such as God forgiveth, and accepteth, but that it is unlawful for us to joyn with them, lest it make us guilty of their sin, this (though it should be erroneous, and uncharitable, and sinful) yet is not to Excommunicate that Congregation as no Church, or no Christians. But to say of any Congregation, that they want anything essential to Christianity, or to make them capable to be loved as Christians, or that their Worship of God is Idolatry, or so bad, as that God accepteth it not, the evil of it being greater than the good, (as poison in our food) and on this reason to declare that no good Christian shoule Communicate with them, this is to Excommunicate such Congregation, as far as one Church may Excommunicate another, whiche is but by such renouncing their Communion.

XXXVIII. There is no History that I have seen or heard that tells us of any Churches on Earth that for many hundred years together did Worship God without a Liturgy as faulty as ours : To make them all Idolaters, and such whose Worship God cursed and accepted not, is to make them no true Churches; and if Christ had no Church, he was no Head and King of it, and so no Christ.

XXXIX. The use of faulty Liturgies is no worse than the use of faulty Translations of the Holy Scripture, which yet Christ and his Apostles ordinarily used, (of which I shall say more anon.)

XL. I have before proved how faulty the Priests Calling was in Christs time, and the Temple and Synagogue Worship, and the Pharisees long Liturgies, on pretence whereof they devoured Widows Houses, and their corrupt Doctrine; and how great the faults were in the Churches of Corinth, Galatia, Ephesus, Sardis, Laodicea, Thyatira, Pergamos, and those that James wrote to, from which none were commanded to depart : And to Condemn Christ or his Apostles,

as favouring, or using sinful Communion, is worse in Christians than it was in the Pharisees.

These are the Principles, and this is the Cause for which I write: And I cannot defend it without opposing those that openly militate against it. If the Woman of Tekab could have told David that any one had held, or hindered her Son from killing his Brother, she would not have called him unpeaceable. It was hard measure that the striving Israelite offered to Moses, that said, *Who made thee a Prince, and a Judge over us? Intendest thou to kill me, as thou killedst the Egyptian?* And all for saying, *Wherfore smitest thou thy fellow?* If we could as charitably judge of a godly man that differs from us, as of our selves, and most esteemed Partners, how much sin should we avoid?

But Reader, agree with me in this cause of Christian Love and Concord, and then think of me and my Writings what thou seest meet. The question is not which of us is the Wildest, or hath done best, but how we should all please the God of Love and Peace, and avoid the Evils which have long threatened us, and which with grief I must say, our mistakes, and miscarriages in Religion have brought upon us, and are like to increase. Many seem like a Ship of Passengers, whose Pilot hath cast them by Error on the Sands or Rocks; and some that pity them as they are sinking, tell them that their Pilots mistake hath endangered them, and they must take better advice. And instead of accepting help, they revile the helpers as injurious, unpeaceable, dishonourers of their wise and faithful Pilot. And if far worse be not yet at hand, Free-grace must wonderfully frustrate this prognostick.

S. E. C. T. 3.

IV. But somewhat, Reverend Sir, you oblige me to say about my supposed Doctrinal Errors, which you have found in my praises of Dr. O. (Had I dispraised him as much, you might have found more.)

I said, that [I doubt not but his Soul is now with Christ, and though Heaven have no sorrow, it hath great Repentance, and that Dr. O. is now more against the receiving of this mistake than I am, and by defending it, you far more displease him than me.] Here my supposed Errors are three.

I. That I suppose him to know so much in Heaven. This being but played with as in jest, I answer the more briefly to it in earnest.

II. I am not of the Socinians mind, that lay the Soul aside, and let it sleep till the Resurrection: Nor do I believe that Souls in Paradise

with Christ, are more ignorant than they were in the Body. 2. And therefore I think the Doctor knoweth what he wrote, and did on Earth, and is not fallen into forgetfulness. 3. And that he knoweth into whose hands he gave those Papers, and what mind the men were of, and how they were received while he lived, if they have been so long extant as you seem to intimate, and that they were justified then. 4. And if the Saints shall judge the world, and be like, or equal to the Angels, I do not think that the concerns of this life are any more below their regard, nor more impertinent to them, than to the Angels: Nor that they live as unconcerned Strangers to Earth (when a Sun-beam can reach so far.) The Souls under the Altar, that cryed *how long*, knew that their blood was unrevenged on Earth^{as to}. Nor do I believe that Christ, with whom they are, and the Angels that here attended them, are so strange to them, as to tell them nothing of the Earth. But lest you feign that I suppose them to have News-books, Gazetts, or Post-letters hence, I only advise you that justly extol his Learning, and Wisdom on Earth, nor to bring him too low in Heaven, in comparison of us imprisoned Sinners, nor make him an ignoramus: And then we will but agree, that if he know of our faults here, he is against them, but if he think you are all changed since he died, there is mistake in Heaven. It followeth not that Souls in Heaven know *nothing by Angels*, because they know not *all things*: Nor that of themselves they know not what a man here may know by common reason, that the effects will be like the Cause, and his many Friends that owned his mistake on Earth, will some of them yet own them.

I can but be sorry (for I am not so presumptuous as to think to change your Judgment) if the contrary supposition be [*your best Weapon*] against the Popish Superstition of praying to Saints: For all this I will hope that you do not pray to Dr. O. for so much as you believe he knoweth, nor yet feign him stark ignorant for fear of praying to him? *Do you think he hath forgotten the safe of England?* Or will you pray to him to intercede for it,

II. My second supposed Errour is, that the Saints in Heaven have any displeasure: And this is said to be [*a Contradiction to the generally received Opinion of all that you have met with.*] I doubt not but your Acquaintance is large, but I perceive it is not with all sorts of men. I am sorry they should generally deny so great and clear a truth.

1. Let us examine the Controversy, as of the *Matter*, and 2. As of the *Name* [*Displeasure.*] 1. *Complacence* is the first act of the will upon Good as Good, before it come to *Election of Compared Goods*, (which is usually *de Medietate*:). *Displacence* is its contrary, and its object is *Evil as Evil*. One is called *Volition*, or *Willing*, the other *Nolition*, or *Nilling*. As *Pleaseness*, and *Displeaseness* are in the *Passions*, and signify *Joy* and *Trouble*, we have nothing here to do with them, (having expressly excluded *sorrow*) but as they are in the *Will*. I thought till now

now, that all sober Divines had been agreed (Protestants and Papists) that not only in Saints and Angels, and Christ as Man, but in God himself (who is most remote from imperfection) there is Complacence, and Displacence, Willing, and Nilling, which though in Creatures that have Accidents, they really differ as Acts, yet in God who is most simple, they are (say the subtler part of the School Doctors) but the Essence of God by extrinsick denomination from relation of the effects, differenced from the Essence simply considered, and from each other; or as the Scotists *formaliter*, or as the Thomists *ratione ratiocinata*; but none deny these to be in God. I suppose that Volition or Complacence you deny not: As to *Displacence* or *Nolition*, answering the Judgments dislike, I prove that it is in Heaven, in God and Creatures.

2. If the will of God, Angels, and Spirits, have any Act about *Evil*, it is *Displacence*; But some Act about Evil they have, Ergo, &c.

For the Major, if they have any Act, it is Displacence, or Complacence, for the will hath no other primary Acts before Election, (even *frui & intendere*, presupposing this Complacence:) But God and good Spirits have no Complacency in sin or evil as such: Ergo they have a Displacence: *Aut placet aut displaceat*, being the first in nature.

That God or Spirits at least have some Act of will about evil as such, is commonly agreed: Else all the sin and evil in the world would come to pass, without any Act of God, or good Spirits in Heaven about it: Sure they that for Predetermination have written so many Volumes, (and one against me) are not of that mind. They say this is to feign God, and all in Heaven asleep, or having nothing to do with Earth: I have my self proved indeed (with others) that God hath no Volition or Complacency of Evil as such, but a Displacence I have proved.

3. If God have no Displacence as to sin, then there is no effectual impediment to it; but all the world would be drowned in wickedness: For the Creature would presently run into evil. But sin is restrained—

If any in excess of subtlety say, that Nolitions are not in God, but Volitions of the Good, are instead of Nolitions of Evil, this is bold, and at least the language unfit, and reductively these Volitions are Nolitions of their Contraries. And however none of this can be feigned of Souls.

4. If God be not displeased with sin, then his prohibitions are no signs of his displeasure; any more than his Commands. But, &c.

4. Then his Judgments and Execution in Hell, are no effects of his displeasure.

5. Then Christ came not to reconcile us to a displeased God, nor is he any more displeased with Persecutors than Saints, nor with cursing than with blessing, nor with any man for doing it.

6. If the subtlety which I have taken notice of in my *Catholick Thesis*.

gy, asserting Volitions without *Notions* in God, were defensible, it would, as I said, be of no truth as to Creatures; if Souls in Heaven have no displease[n]ce against sin, how is their *will* holy in the Image of God, that hateth Iniquity? Devils love sin; Stones, and Brutes neither love, nor hate it. Saints in Heaven hate it, and love it not: merely *not-loving* it is not their full holiness.

7. If Saints there are not displeased with sin, how can they glorify Christ for dying for it, or God for punishing it.

8. Or how can they be everlastingl[y] thankful to Christ for saving them from it.

9. What a change must they impute to Christ that came so low, and suffered as in a fort forsaken, to destroy the works of the Devil, and now hath not so much as the least displeasednes with sin.

10. Then Christ and Saints there are no more displeased at Persecution, Prophanenes, Murder, Adultery, then at Piety and Love.

11. Then it no more displeaseth Souls there, that they here sinned, then that they did well: *Paul's* mind is much changed then about his Persecution. The best is, though you and yours are offended with me, it is not displeasing to Dr. O. if he know it. But if your reason be, because that all displeasednes hath some *suffering* of the mind, or *trouble*, 1. As to my meaning you know I excluded sorrow. 2. And it is not true that you suppose. Pure *Displacency* of the *will* in God, and the blessed, hath no trouble: It is not exercised in a body that hath a Heart, or Head troubled by commotion of the Blood and Spirits, nor yet in an imperfect Soul that hath hurting passions. It is the pure perfection of the will; and nothing but its *Aversion* from sin; and contrary to Love: Love and Hatred are names that may well here be used, but *Complacence*, and *Displeasure* being the same, sound as les to signify Passion. And if there be Passion in Heaven, (which you cannot disprove) it might be without diminution of felicity.

II. But I am not hopeles that you will deny none of all this as to the matter, but turn all into a quarrel at *words*, and say that the name of *Displeasure* is not fit for any Act of God or Saints, or Angels in Heaven: If that be the worst (which is bad enough), let us next try that wordy Controversy. I. By Scripture. II. By School Divines. III. By common practical Divines.

I. Scripture use of words in Sacred Things is our best Dictionary. He that is our great Teacher, knoweth how to speak: If you dislike his words, methinks you should not accuse Men of Errour, and that against the common sense of all that you meet with, for imitating God, and speaking as he doth: And that at the same time when you are defending one that would have no Mode, or Accidentals in Worship used, which God prescribeth not. If by my words I must be Justified, or Condemned,

tied, I hope God will not condemn me for speaking as he taught me, no more then for doing as he bid me, though all your party should do it. And I can bear their Condemnation.

The Hebrew phrase which we translate by *Displeasing God or Man*, is oft [*It was Evil in his Eyes*] which speaketh a positive Act of the Understanding *de malo*: And that there was no answerable Act of the Will, let him say that dare.

Prov. 24. 17, 18. *Rejoice not when thy Enemy falleth, and let not thy heart be glad when he stumbleth, lest the Lord see it, and be displeased with him.* No, say you, fear not that any in Heaven should be displeased.

Gen. 38. 10. *The thing that he did displeased the Lord, wherefore he slew him.*

Num. 11. 1. *When the people complained, it displeased the Lord—his anger was kindled.*

3 Sam. 11. 27. *The thing that David had done displeased the Lord, (Murder, and Adultery.)* No, say you, God is not displeased with any sin, there is no displeasure in Heaven.

1 Chr. 21. *God was displeased with this thing, therefore he smote Israel.*

Psal. 60. 1. *O God—thou hast been displeased.*

Isa. 59. 15. *The Lord saw it, and it displeased him.*

Zech. 1. 2. 15. *The Lord hath been sore displeased, or displeased with displeasure—I am very sore displeased with the Heathen—I was but a little displeased.*

Psal. 6. 1. *O Lord rebuke me not in thine anger, neither chasten me in thy hot displeasure.*

Psal. 2. 5. *He shall speak to them in his anger, and vex them in his sore displeasure.*

Deut. 9. 19. *Moses saith, [*I was afraid of the great anger, and hot displeasure wherewith the Lord was hot against you to destroy you.*] I am sorry that you all differ from Moses.*

And Expositors suppose that when God is said to have *no pleasure in fools*, or in wickedness, &c. Eccl. 5. 4. Ps. 5. 4. it signifieth *displeasure*.

But the Scripture ascribeth to God not only *Displeasure*, but *Hatred*, which signifieth the greatest *displeasure*, Deut. 16. 23. Psal. 11. 5. *The wicked, and him that loveth violence, his soul hateth,* Isa. 1. 14. Mal. 2. 16. Psal. 5. 5. *Thou hatest all the workers of Iniquity, &c* 45. 7. *thou hatest wickedness,* Rev. 2. 6. 15. *The Doctrine of the Nicolaitans—which I also hate,* Zech. 8. 17. Amos 5. 21 & 6. 8. Jer. 44. 4. *O do not this abominable thing which I hate,* Isa. 61. 8. Prov. 8. 13. & 6. 16. I thought those that overstretch [*Esau have I hated*] would not have denied all *displeasement* in God.

But if I should go further, and cite all the Texts that ascribe even *Anger* and *Wrath* to God, and say *he is angry every day, &c.* and that his *wrath*

wrath shall punish the Wicked, I suppose it would do more to weary the Reader, than to convince your Party.

II. But my 2d Appeal is to the Accurate Scholastick Writers, because I suppose you will say that the Scripture speaketh popularly, & after the manner of Men. *Ans.* (Or else it must not speak to Men.) But here I should much more confound most Readers, if I should call them to Metaphysics, or Metaphysical Writers ; I should cite to them many sheets out of *Aquinas, Scotus, Ockam, Durandus, Bonaventure*, and all their followers, who commonly ascribed *Displacency*, as well as *Complacence to God*. If you need Witnes in this case, read them, and seek it, and pardon me for not abusing the Reader with such Citations.

III. The same I say of the consent of Practical Protestant Divines. I do not think the Reader would forgive me, if I should prove that *Luther, Calvin, Melanthon, Bucer*, and all the Foreign Reformers, and all our Martyrs, and English Divines, Episcopal, Presbyterian, and (whatever you say against it, to their injury) Independants also ascribe *Displacency to God* : Sure they that translated the Bible did. And surely the Writings of *Hildersham, Dod, Greenham, Rogers, Preston, Sibbs, Bolton, Whateley, Allen*, and hundreds such, are far from disowning such expressions.

But methinks I should not need to suppose you to object that it is not God, but Man that you speak of: No, I will not abuse you so much as to suppose that you take man to be more perfect, and less Passive than God. Indeed *Displacency*, and *Complacence in God*, are Active *ad extra*, and signify but the perfection of his will, and *extenter*, the expressions and effects, and no Passivity : But all Creatures are Passive as well as Active, and they are receptive *ab obiectu*, both in their *Ideal Conceptions*, and their *Appetites*: And therefore *Displeasure* in a far groser Passive sense, must be ascribed to the Creature, then to the Creator : and yet without any diminution of felicity.

And 2. It is certain that Christ himself was much displeased with sin on Earth, *Mark 10. 14 & 3. 5*. And surely he is not any less perfect, nor more reconciled to sin in Heaven. He was *displeased* with it, when he died for it : and is his will changed since to favour it ? Yea, if you should say that [*sin is nothing, and therefore no object of a Divine Act*] of Nolition, or hatred, but God is said to will or hate it, only because he doth not will or love it, but punish it ; yet the Church hath long ago Condemned the *Monothelites* as Heretics, and determined that Christ hath two Wills and Operations : And therefore as Man, his knowledge and will must have somewhat of Passivity, though not of Pain.

2. And it's strange that Christ is made our Captain, and manageth a War against Satan in the world, and *Michael* and his Angels are engaged in it, and yet have not the least displeasure against Sin and Satan.

3. And that Christ hath such terrible threatenings against Sin and Sinners,

siers, even everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his Angels, the Worm that never dieth, and the fire that is not to be quenched, and that he shall come in flaming fire, rending vengeance, &c. that all they might be damned that obeyed not the truth, &c. that the Wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all Ungodliness, and Unrighteousness of men, &c. that fiery indignation shall devour the Adversaries; all Kindreds of the Earth shall wait because of him, and he will say, Those mine Enemies that would not I should Reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me: Depart from me all ye that work Iniquity, &c. And yet hath not the least displeasure at Sin or Sinners. That most of the World must lye in Hell, and feel no effects of Christ's displeasure, because he hath none.

And Angels and Saints are not perfecter than Christ, but are of his mind, and are displeased with Sin, and Persecutors, and Devils in conformity to Christ.

The Saints in Heaven have not forgotten their former sins: The remembrance of them hath some effect: It is not *Pleasidness* with the evil; therefore it is *Displeasidness*; they are not ignorant of all the Wickedness, Injustice, Violence, Persecution, and Blood-shed on Earth, and all the sufferings of the Just: They love not this with Complacency: Therefore they hate it with *Displeasidne*; or else they are senseless neuters.

Do the Angels pour out the Vials, do the Souls under the Altar pray for revenge, are the Heavens and the holy Apostles and Prophets bid rejoice over Babylon, Rev. 18. 20. and yet none of them so much as displeased at Babylon's sin, or the Churches suffering?

Sure you do not so far disagree from us in all this, as to deny the matter: I hope it is but a false Conceit of the unites of the word: And if the word [*Displeasidne*] do displease you, why would not so accurate a Reprover once tell us what word it is that he would have used instead of it? We that are accused, know that [*Nolition*, *Displeasidne*, *Aversion*, *Hatred* (or as *Campanella* calls it *Disamor*) are words of the same signification as to the *will*, answering *dislike* in the understanding, (yea, *dislike* oft signifieth both.) If you cannot bear these, sure you are less patient at the words [*Wrath and Anger of God*] &c. what is it that you would have? Even *Nothingnes* is an object of *Nolition* to the blessed; for they are averse to annihilation, so that the quibble that *malum est privatio*, will be here of no use to you; for what is more displeasing than *Privation*?

Dear Brother, I am so far from perceiving any Conviction in your Accusation in this matter, that I must say that you have in this made your self to me what Dr. O. did in the case of Concord. You constrain me to bear my publick Testimony against you, when you pretend herein to speak the mind of so great a number of your Acquaintance, when I remember the Sermons that are commonly talkt of, and the Collections

made by the *Friendly Debater*, and many such others, I look to hear e're long from Prefs and Pulpits, ["That the Nonconformists teach that no "Rebellion, Treason, Perjury, or Wickedness is at all displeasing to God, "to Christ, to Angels, or to any Saint in Heaven: Though they call "Adulterers, Murderers, and such others to Repentance, and Mourning "for Sin, and separate from others as too bad for their Communion, in- "deed at the same time they tell all the wicked, neither God, nor any in "Heaven is displeased with them.]

Fore-seeing this scandal, I humbly address my self to such Accusers with this answr following.

[Take not verbal differences for real: No doubt but this Persons Errour is meerly verbal: All Mens Studies go not one way: It's like he is not vers'd in Philosophers, and Schoolmens Writings, that use *Dissidence* and *Complacency* for meer Nolition and Volition, Hatred, or Aver-sation, and Love. And though he knew that Scripture, and Christian Writers commonly speak that which he accuseth, he was someway by-assed to think that I used the same words in a worle sense than Scripture, and all Writers do (though I excluded sorrow:) And his interesting in his Errour, [*The general received Opinion of all that be bath met with*] doth but signify what sort of Men, and how few he hath met with, or how few Writers on such Subjects he hath read, and remembred, (for doubtles he doth not knowingly abuse them.) And when did all the Protestants, or Nonconformists chuse him to represent them? why is not my word as valid on the contrary, who remember not one Man, Protestant, or Papist, or Heathen that is for the Immortality of the Soul, that is, of the Opinion which he expresseth; except those few that hold that *non datur verè malum*, There is no Evil in the World, but all that we call sin and punishment is good, and miscalled evil by us in dark-ness, but all willed by God, and those in Heaven? yet even Hobbs, and Peter Sterry confess a good sort of Evil. And I doubt not but this Brother is against what he speaketh himself.

And to stop your Censures, let me ask you, if one mistaker accuse us all, whom we never authorized to reprent us, doth this lay so great a blot on us, as an erring Council of Bishops doth on the Clergy, whom they represent: And yet how great a number of Councils have falsely reported the Doctrine of the Church.

I will stop your mouth now but with the last words of *Sulpicius Severus History*. [*Ac inter nostras perpetuum discordiarum bellum exarserat: quod jam per quindecim annos fidelis dissectionibus agitatum nullo modo soptri poterat. Et nunc cum maxime discordis Episcoporum turbulis ac miseri omnia cernerentur, cunctaque per eos odio: aut gratia, metu, inconstancia, invidia, falso, libidine, avaritia, arrogancia, somno, desidia effusa depravata, postremo plures adversum paucos bene consulentes insatis concilijs & pertinacibus studiis*

certabant: Inter haec plebs Dei & optimus quisque probro neque iudicio habebatur.] Read the Author, lest you think I made these words for our times. And of their Captain Bishop he saith, [*Certe Ithacum nihil pensi, nihil sancti habuisse definio: Fuis enim audax, loquax, impudens, sumptuosus, ventri & gula placidum impertiens, hic stultitia eo usque processit, ut omnes eriam sanctos viros quibus aut studium in erat lectionis, aut proposum erat certare jejuniis tanquam Priscilliani socios in crimen arcesseret.*] (And yet saith that the Perfection of the *Priscillianists* did but increase them.) Pardon this digression, by which you may see that if you be not responsible for all that Councils, and the Major part of Bishops say or do, much less are we for the verbal Error of one or a few men, though fathered by them on many, whereby they necessitate these our open disclaimings of their words.

III. My third supposed Error is much like the former, saying, that [*Though Heaven have no sorrow, it hath great repentance.*] In this [*all Protestants*] are (falsly) said to be against me. Here also the Error is either Verbal or Real. And, i. He knows that as to the word *all Protestants* own the Scripture, which alcribeth *Repenting* to God himself, *Exod. 32.12.* *Deut. 32. 36.* *Psal. 135. 14.* *Jer. 18. 8, 10. & 26. 3. 13.* *Jon. 3. 9, 10.* *Gen. 6. 6.* *Judg. 2. 18.* *1 Sam. 15. 35.* *2 Sam. 24. 16.* *Am. 7. 3, 6.* *Joel 2. 13.* *Jer. 15. 6.* It's true that this is not spoken of God, as if he had any mutability as man hath; But God being infinitely more perfect then man, the phrase is further fetcht, and less proper of God then of man: Therefore it is not the *Name* that he blameth, seeing he owneth the Word of God.

II. And if it be not the *Name*, but *my sense* of it, do you find where he prooveth any wrong sense that I exprest, or doth he give a better?

I said in a Book [*There is not such a thing as grief or sorrow known in Heaven.*] The Vindicator citeth this as if it were contrary to, [*There is no sorrow, but displeasure and repentance:*] If he mean not that [*no sorrow, and no sorrow*] are Contradictions, he need to have gone no further then the present sentence for it. And if he had proved that [*no sorrow,*] and *Displisce*, or *Repentance* are Contradictions, he would have done that against the Scripture itself, which he intended not, nor can do.

He hath prevented my labour in transcribing other Authors that use *autem* and *verius* usually for a meer change of the mind, purpose, and practice, without any signification of sorrow, and he appealeth to Scripture use of the words: But is there any thing besides *sorrow*, that by all his words he labours to exclude? And did not I expressly exclude it? And yet is this Reverend man thus puzzled at this as a dangerous Doctrine? Doth he attempt in one syllable to blame any thing but the *word*? When I excluded his misliked *lenfe*? And he will not deny the ordinary use of the word as without *sorrow*? But let us willingly take the Scripture use:

which speaketh of *Repentance* in *Heaven*, and on *Earth*. It is not *Repentance* on Earth that we have now to treat of: And do you think it's a good Argument that there is no *Repentance* in *Heaven* without sorrow, because there is none on Earth without it? But even on Earth, *Repentance* is either the *Act* of the *Intellect, and Will*, alone, or an *Act* of these joyned with divers *Passions*. It is sometime so largely taken, that the *Passions* of grief, shame, and fear, and specially anger against our selves, are parts of it: But in all common Authors, and ordinary use, and even in Scripture, it is taken for the change of *Mind* and *Will*, the *Passions* being but effects, or concomitants of it. To *Repent*, in the common and prime sense, is but to *change our Mind and Will, and wish we had not done what we did*. When a thing was well done of us, and yet sped not well, we repent and wish we had not done it for the sake of the event: but we blame not our selves for the *Act*, nor grieve for that, but for the event. But usually we have cause of *Sorrow*, as well as of *Repentance*, and must joyn them together. But where the *Gospel* frequently promiseth *Repentance, pardon, and life together*, and Preacheth both *Repenting* and *Believing*, in order to present joy, there is little mention of the sorrow in the Converts, save for the murdering of Christ, or some great sin. And *Sorrow*, and *Repenting* are distinguished in Scripture as two things, 2 Cor. 7. 9, 10. *I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to Repentance----For Godly sorrow worketh Repentance to salvation, not to be repented of.* [Is the sense [*Godly sorrow worketh Godly sorrow?*] No, but a change of mind and life, Heb. 6. 1. It is not called [*Repentance for dead works,*] but [*from dead works,*] as speaking the change, rather than the grief.

Exod. 13. 17. *Lest the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt:* Hence *fear* is the moving *Passion*, and *Repenting* is *wishing* they had not left *Egypt*, and *returning* is the effect. I am readier to think that sorrow is no part, but an adjunct of *Repentance* in the strictest, properst sense, then that it is no *Repentance* without sorrow: sure the specifying faculties of Man are the *Intellect* and *Will*; and I think the specifying *Acts* of Rational true *Repentance*, are the *Acts* of the same faculties, and *Sorrow* is but such an adjunct as *shame* and *anger* at our selves are.

But it is *Repentance in Heaven* that is our subject: And I have cited you Texts enough which speak of *Gods Repenting*: And do you believe that he hath sorrow? You'll say, that's but metaphorically spoken? Ans. No more is knowledge, or will, or any such *Act* that we can speak of. God: But if it be not a name unmeet to be spoken of God; are Souls there greater, or happier then he.

But we find no talk in Scripture of any in *Heaven* Repenting, save God: No wonder: How little hath God told us of the particular state and action of separated Souls, before the Resurrection; when it pleaseth God so sparingly to mention their present state, (yea, and their immortality)

tality in the old Testament; I shall we feign that he must tell us of all their thoughts?

But all these Acts of Repentance Souls in Heaven have. 1. They know more of their sins both as to the matter and evil, then ever they did on Earth. 2. They own their Culpability, that is, that they are the Souls that committed these sins, and deserved Death and Hell for them. 3. They know the goodness of all the ways that are contrary to their sin. 4. They love all that good, and hate all their sin more than they did here. 5. They wish they had never committed them. 6. If it were to do again, they would not do it.

This is proper true Repentance: Either you deny the *Thing*, or but the *Name*. If the *Thing*, which of these deny you.

1. If Saints in Heaven know not sin better then they did here, Heaven is to them as dark as Earth.

2. If they know not that they themselves were the Subjects, and Actors of these sins, they are ignorant, or erroneous.

3. If they know not that Gods way is better than sin, they are brutish.

4. If they love Good, and hate Evil no better then here, then they are no better.

5. If their will do not wish that they had not done it, then their will is not holy and averse to sin: Either they review it with approbation, (which you believe not) or with dislike, or senselessly, with no act of will. If with dislike, and displiceance, as before is proved, that hatred, or aversion contains a wish, they had never done it. Else David, Peter, Paul, &c. were better Men on Earth then in Heaven: For here they wisht they had not been guilty of Murder, Persecution, &c. And if they wish it not there, their wills are more unholy than here.

Perhaps you'll say, *It's a vain wish of an impossibility?* Ans. No such matter: I talk not of a *prayer*, or a *desire* that *factum non factum sit*; but a *Velle* or *Malleum me non peccare*: I had rather I had not sinned: And that is not *vain*, which is the *Wills perfection* or *Holiness* itself.

6. And that they would not do the like again, I need not prove.

I were a greater dishonourer of Heavenly felicity, if I denied any of these, then you feign me to be. I doubt not but those aforesaid that are disposed to obloquy, will take occasion from your words (yea, the *Papists* from your entitling all Protestants to it) to say [The Nonconformists (or the Protestants) hold that Murder, Rebellion, Persecution, and all sin is so small a matter to their Saints in Heaven, that they do not so much as Repent of it, or will or wish they had never done it. Therefore they either justify it, or are neuters to it.]

They say that the Mother of Lombard, Gratian, and Pet. Comestor being a Whore, said she could not repent of the Fornication that had begot three such Sons: If any say that the Saints in Heaven do not so much as,

will, or will that they had not sinned, because Christ is glorified by saving them from it, they pervert the Gospel Doctrine of Grace, and would teach the justified on Earth to be impenitent.

But if you return to wordy Quarrels again, and say all these Acts ought not to be called *Repentance*, if they have not sorrow. 1. I durst not so make my self Master of Languages, against the use of all the world. 2. And against the Scripture that speaketh of Gods Repenting. 3. Nor against Etymology. 4. And against the nature of the Case. Men in flesh have sin and danger, and Bodies lyable to sensible commotion of Spirits, and so to grief. Those in Heaven are not such: They have no cause of grief, and yet have renewed faculties of mind and will, which disgust sin, and hate it, and are turned from it to a contrary love and life. Even here, if a man by his own sin and folly had shut up himself twenty years in a Dungeon, or put out his Eyes, and never seen the light, suppose this man suddenly deliver'd into the light, and he would not stay to mourn for his former state, but the sudden joy would exclude sorrow: And yet his change would be a true Repentance for what he did.

But as you have wronged all Protestants by fathering your Error on them, you have made it my duty to vindicate them with my self.

But I am grown such a Prodigal of my Reputation with Men of such a judging disposition, that I will cast away a little more of it on your Centurie. The Scripture speaketh so much more of our Glory after the Resurrection, then before, and purposely keepeth us so low in our knowledge of the particular state of Souls before, and *Calvin*, (whom I suppose you take not for an Heretick) for all his Treatise against *the sleep of Souls*, did think the difference was so great between the state of the separated Souls, and that at the Resurrection, that I must profess my ignorance to be so great, that I am uncertain whether this first state do set all the blessed so high, as that no thought is consistent with it, that hath the least degree of suffering.

For, 1. I know that all Creatures are Passive. 2. If felicity be imperfect till the Resurrection, it must be privatively, or positively, or both. If privatively, how can I prove that nothing positive may concur, when privation is as bad. 3. I think that Protestants mostly agree, that Christs own Soul, while his Body was in the Grave, was in Paradise, in Joy, and yet in a state that was partly Penal, as it was a separation from the Body by death. And that all Souls in Heaven are happy, and yet in a state partly Penal in Heaven itself, as they are separated from the body, and short of the Resurrection: For not only the minute of dying, but the state of death is Penal, to a Soul that defireth a return to the body: And yet Heaven may be to it unconceivable felicity. I only hence conclude, that we must not take on us to know more than we do of separate

separate Souls, nor to make a measure or manner of blessedness for them of our own heads, nor to apply every Text to them that is spoken of the state after the Resurrection : There is enough besides to feast our joyful hopes.

IV. Some few other practical Doctrines we differ about, as where Mg. 30. you say ["I doubt not to affirm that doing that which a Law requires, so far as the intention is moved by the Law, is a justifying of it. And so, missing to any Law on the consideration of its penalties, is so far a justifying its preceptive part, as not so great an evil as the Penal."]

Ans. I first premise that this is little or nothing to the Cause I pleaded for ; For whereas you say [Note that I know of no such Law, simply, or without any dependence or human Sanction.] I have largely told you that taking publick Communion to be *but de facto* what it is, and the *Liturgy* as commonly used, I take it to be a duty to hold such Communion (where no better at least is) though there were no human Sanction, but voluntary Concord ; and this by virtue of Gods great Commands of glorifying him with one mind and mouth in Unity, Love, and Peace; nor an immutable duty, but a duty *rebus sic stantibus*. It is in obedience to Gods Commands more than Mens, that I have gone to the Parish Churches; and would have gone as much, if the Law had not commanded it, but only had deprived me of better.

But as to your *undoubted* affirmation, I am as much past doubt that it is not true as you unlimitedly express it. The intention may be moved by a Law for the effects, or consequents sake, and not justify the Law, but only justify the *Act of the Subject* : Yea, it may be moved by the formal Authority of the Law-giver, express by his Law, and yet not justify the Law.

Joseph and Mary were Taxed with others by *Augustus* Law : They were moved by that Law, and its effects to pay the Tax : And yet justified not the Law, nor decided the Case, whether it were by Right or Usurpation : All Conquered People by unjust War, may obey a Taxing Law : The *Judaes* might obey the *Pheasants*, that forbade them Smiths, and Swords, &c. They may labour, and Travel, and pay Taxes, moved by unjust Laws, and yet not justify the Law, but only their own Acts. When Christ sent *Peter* to take a Fish with Money in his Mouth, and pay Tribute, the Law moved his intention, because of the offence that would follow the breaking of it : And yet his answer intimateth that he justified not the Law : If he carried his flocks at their Command, that justified not their Command : If he bid us give our Coat to him that sueth us for our Cloak, if the Law be against us, it proveth not he bids us justify the Law. If a Confessor go to Prison, or Banishment, or to the Gallows, or fire without resistance, to do this as moved by the Law, is no justifying of the Law. If the Protestants in France should pay each man a yearly Tribute for liberty of Conscience, or the Christians under the

Turk pay Poll-money, moved by the Law, this justifieth not the Law. I am perfluated your Church would gladly pay somewhat for liberty of Worship, and yet not justify the Law that required it.

If the Law required us to meet for Gods Worship at an inconvenient place or time, or to use a version of Psalms in Meeter, or a Translation of Scripture that is not the best, he that useth these in obedience to this (because Concord in these according to Law, is better then a better Version, Translation, Hour, Place, with Discord, and because Obedience may do more good then better circumstances would without it) yet doth not hereby justify the Law. If the Law bid you appear before Justices or Judges that are bad men, and unjust, you may obey the Law, and not justify it.

Dear Brother, I will not aggravate your Error by its ill Consequences: But you and I tell the world, what need all men have of pardon in our mistakes, even when we are most confident.

2. And as to your second affirmation, it is not true without limitation, ["That submitting to a Law, on consideration of the Penalties, is so far a justifying its preceptive part, as not so great an evil as the Penal."]

This is confuled work: The *preceptive part of the Law* is *actus praeципientis*, the Commanders Act; The instances before mentioned tell you that this may be obeyed for the Penalty sake, when yet the evil of the Commaad, or Law, is sinful, and so worse than the Penalty or Obedience, which are not sin: Forgive me for telling you that you should have distinguished the *preceptive part of the Law* from the *mater Commandata* by it, and the *evil of the Law and Law-maker*, from the *evil of the Obeyer*; and then only have concluded that he that obeyeth a Precept only to avoid the Penalty, professeth the Penalty to be worse then his Act of Obedience. But he doth not make it worse then the Law, or the Law-makers sin.

If a Law did Command me to appear before a Lay-Civilian, who useth the Keys of the Church, and this on pain of Death, or Imprisonment, I may be moved both by Precept and Penalty to appear, as being better then either refusal, or penalty, and yet not think that the Law or Precept is a less evil in itself, or its ends, to the Law-maker, or the publick? (Whether this thought be right or wrong, is nothing to our question) so if I were by Law commanded to joyn in the Lyturgy, on pain of Death, or Imprisonment, or being deprived of all other Church Worship, I may think this Law worse than my sufferings, and yet think my Obedience to it my Duty.

Yea, if a Law bid me play with Childrens Bubbles, or any such trifling, on pain of Death, the Case would be the same.

And if any should take occasion by your confident judgment to refuse to obey, wherever he may not justify the preceptive part of the Law, the effect would be worse then of my naming Dr. o.

S E C T . 4.

I told you I have no leisure to write Books for my self now: Thus far I have written for Truth, and Love, and Unity. As to all your Charges against my self, I say again, I will not justify my self: My naming Dr. *Owen*, which is so heinously taken, I have told you the occasion of. To which I truly add, 1. I did it as a distinctive note, that the Readers might know what it was that I answered. 2. And I that use to put my Name to my Writing, never dreamt that it would have been taken any worse to name him, than to confute a Writing that by common, uncontrolled supposition bore his Name. Had I thought it would have been taken so ill (while the Super-Conformists bear far more) it's two to one but I had forborn it. And now it's done, I am yet but little wiser, when I think of the publick Cause fore-described, I am ready to think it should weigh down all your contrary reasons: When I feel in my self an inward averseness to strive with any by ungrateful words, and hear from you how ill it's taken, then I dislike it: And my own selfish lothness to be the object of the hard thoughts, and talk of so many of you, is some byas to my judgment. I wholly follow the Rule you mention, to choose that which doth most good, and least hurt: And truly the reverence of your own, and some others judgment, telling me that it doth more hurt than good, doth turn the Scales, and make me repent that I named the Doctor.

And I leave your Charges against me to their best advantage, to the Reader, though my inclination is much to open the mistakes.

I may give a brief touch to your self, for your information, which I expect not should affect the Reader, suppose your Book to lie open before you.

Pag. 1. 1. If you thought them not good enough to be his, nor intended for publick view, why did you wrong him so much, (and the people much more) as to divulge them with his Name?

Pag. 2. Do good men take it for privilege to hurt the Church uncontradicted?

2. The more are displeased with Truth, the greater is the disease that needeth it.

3. To be zealous for Love, against Hatred, and its Causes, is not so bad as to need to be quenched. It is zeal for a Sect against Unity, which corrupt nature is for.

4. I doubted not but guilt would be impatient

5. It was your Party that wronged his Name, by divulging that which you now take for his disgrace.

Pag. 3. It's wisely done not to own the Cause I oppose, and yet not

let men know whether it be for fear of the Law, or because you are against it.

O that I could have fore-known, that I might have confuted his Arguments without his Name, and displeased no body? I thought you had taken them for his Honour, and not his Disgrace, when so many value them.

Pag. 4. 1. If they are true, they are his Honour: If false, why should I suffer them to do mischief.

2. I named not Mr. *Ralphson*, till all said he openly owned his Books in Prison. Had you rather all that Worship God in Parish Churches, were persuaded that it is Idolatry, than Mr. *Ralphson* should be confuted by name? I hope you have better reasons for concealing your own Name; to do mischief un-named, is not worth pleading for.

Pag. 5. If the work be faulty, why do you not joyn with me to save men from it? And why did your private Letter own it his, conjunct with Fame? And not one Man yet that I hear of, deniyeth it.

2. I offered you to stop it.

3. Is it disingenuity in me to tell you of twenty untruths in your private Letter (and many notorious,) and ingenuity in you to be offended for being told of them, rather than for writing them? This is to comply with the World, that taketh the detester only for the sinner.

4. Is a defensive confutation of Error, dealing severely?

5. Agreeing Copies confute you. To confute Error is not worse then to own or defend it.

Pag. 6. If it be so heinous to confute it, why did you divulge it?

Pag. 7. My Reasons for Love and Concord were long before considered.

2. I had heard of them long in many hands, though till then I never saw them: And you say you saw it a year before.

2. It's strange so knowing a man should think that bad Arguments, with a valued Name, are not dangerous! Yes, even against common sense, as those for Transubstantiation. To confute your self, you add, that [on all sides peoples Opinions are mostly, and most strongly mastered by affections, and it's beyond all our power to cure the disorder.] And yet is there no danger from Names?

Pag. 8. [Must all appearance of Enmity, and bitterness, be laid aside, and Love used, &c.] And yet must we let Men Excommunicate one another, and call all to mutual avoidance, without contradiction? Let Churches and Christians be taught to damn each others Persons, and Worship causelessly, and take each other for Idolaters, for fear of breaking Love and Peace.

2. Do you believe that Dr. *Owens* Name was not known with them before?

3. Mr. *Worrell* came out since, which I compared with Mr. *Rabljous*.

4. Can you tell why I was to name Dr. O. in my *Cure of Church Dissidents*, or his Books : I told you great reasons against it, what now you call a *new advantage*, would have been otherwise called by yours. I was not inclined to note a little evil among much good : If you cannot see the Doctors Arguments there answered by me, I cannot help that : Mift. I transcribe them to convince you. *Pag. 177. Dr. 32.* [Obj. " *Worrell hath God given any new power to prescribe & impose Forms for others, or commandes others to obey them?*] Read the answer, *Pag. 178, 179, 180.* " *At last not as Ministers, p. 181. Christ hath given gifts to all his Ministers, and commanded them to use them : They use them not, when they use imposed Forms.* So *Pag. 190.* p. 196. of approving of sin, and signifying Consent by joining. More fully, *p. 201.* (And in my *Christ. Direct.*) If you never found these Arguments (there answered) in Dr. O. Book, I cannot help that, others have. *Pag. 11.* I thought you had known how usual it is to speak to the second person, in answering Books many hundred years old? If not, you have free leave to take it for my folly : I'll not contend with Quakers, whether we should say [*Thou*] or [*Thou*] nor with you, whether it be better to say [*Him*] or [*You*]. You say, *It displeasest him not.*

Pag. 15. If *numbing mens Errours*, used to do hurt, be worse than committing, or defending them, I mistook.

Pag. 16. I consent that you do so by me, so you speak nothing but truth.

2. Repentance is a hard work, and the impudent impatient; therefore we all suffer what we do.

Pag. 17. My Pleas for Peace have been all ill taken by the other side : And which of you therefore were so offended at them.

2. I am sorry that you feign the *bleeding Parliament* to have disowned our Repentance : I preach to the Parliament but once, and it was for *Repentance*: I have oft publicly accused myself; and I hope I break not the Act of Oblivion by it: They forbade reproaching, and troubling one another, but not remembering our sin, nor feeling when we suffer, nor asking what caused it, to stop the like again, if not for a cu'e. But, dear Brother, do you not know that it was your divulged Writing that rabb'd upon the sore, and broke the Act of Oblivion, if this be breaking it? Did it not tell what work the imposing the Liturgy had made, against [*Reformation for Ignorance, Reviling, and Reaproaching the Spirit* (sic up uncircumcised Ministers, made great dissolutions in the Church, silencing painful Ministers, raising Families, destroying Souls &c.)] Do you think this broke the Act of Oblivion, or is condemned by the bleeding Parliament, or doth nothing break it but on one side. Look on both sides, and tell me how such Argusents misused, should be answered, but by shewing that there was danger, and ill effects also on the contrary extrem. Did the Parliament forbid one side only this Commemoration? I pray you if but one side may be called to Repent, let it be as, that we may be forgiven.

Pag. 18. If you know not that the Principles of *Separation* were the great caufe (in Armies, and elsewhere) of the subversions, and confusions, which brought us to what we have felt, I do : And you would not at once live under the fruit of it as we now do, and I yet make so light of it, as to take it for a *sati mestanger*, if it had cost you as many painful days and nights, as many ungrateful disputes, as many groans and tears, and as much blood as it hath done me : And how little is my part to that which *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland* hath suffered, even by that cause conjunct with Pride, and Ambition, these fourty years? If I may not have leave to say as *Bradford*, *Repent O England*, you should give me leave to Repent my self, that ever I preach one Sermon with any byas of overmuch desire to please Persons of the accusing separating humour.

Pag. 19. I said of our late over-tumblings in England, that all this is publicly known : Many late Volumes on both sides record it : were it but *Whitelocke's Memorials*, it were enough: The Nations ring of it (and I have oft lamented it heretofore) and you mistaking all this, feign me to say, that the passages debated in *Dr. Owen's Papers*, and his words, were all known before ; and to bestow many reproofs upon a fiction of your own.

Pag. 20. You would put such terms upon me in dispute, a *Veto* devised to put on the Protestants. I must oppose his Doctrine only as in the Syllables written. *Accidental is Worship*, *Final*

nify you think at least an Integral Part. Doth [in] turn Accidents into parts? Are Accidents parts, because *Inherent*? Are not your Quality, Quantities, Immanent Acts, Passions, &c. inherent? Is not Kneeling, putting off the Hat, Methods, Translations, Metter, Tunes, &c. is the Worship of God? And is it unlawful, because in it? If it be therefore a part of Worship, you must conclude that either all these are unlawful, or that it's lawful for men to make parts of Gods Worship.

2. Are all things duly belonging to it, parts of it? I believe you own none of this your self.

Pag. 21. The Doctors 7th Argument was, that this [practice condemneth the suffering Saints of the present age, rendering them false Witnesses of God.] I answered; [Let us not stand to any dividing Principle, or Cause, lest the Saints be blamed, that have suffered it in God.] I used the word [Saints] but as repeating his own phrase: And this you make to have better become the Observer. Is not this partiality? May the Argument use a term which the answerer may not repeat? And, dear Brother, is it not a bad case, if among the many ill causes suffered on God, any, or all of them should say, [We must not repent, nor amend, lest we be blamed as false Witnesses of God.]

Pag. 22. Sir, if telling me of any sin that ensnareth Souls, be using me more scurrilously than the most virulent adversaries, spare me not, but use me so: wot me, if Repentance become odious and intolerable.

But I must stop, lest I cross my purpose of not writing for my self, but you.

The conclusion of all is, dear Brethren, the longer I study the Gofpel, and the longer I live in the world, the more fully I am Convinced that Love is the great work of the Spirit, and the Men that Love most, are the best Men, and those the worst, that have least love: And I would write in golden Letters as my Motto, GOD IS LOVE, and he that dwelleth in Love, dwelleth in God, and God is him: And if Christians loved no more than others, they would be no better than they: And that Love desirerth union and familiarity; and that censoriousness, contempt, and flying from each other, both signify, and breed hatred. Could we but so live as to make all our Enemies believe that we heartily love them, it would conquer their enmity, and tie their Hands, and Tongues, by reconciling their Hearts. I know many at this time, to whom God marvellously performeth that promise, *Blessed are the Meek, for they shall inherit the Earth.* No winds root up the grafts, which overthrow the Oaks. *Humility and Love* would Conquer all the world. These overcame Philosophy, and Empire at first. Power may overcome Bodies, and Argument stop Mens Mouths, and yet more enrage them unto Enmity: But Love Conquereth Hearts: Love the Conformists, if you would do them good, or preferre your self from evil: Not that all men must be loved alike, nor sin loved for the Persons sake; but every one according to the measure of his amiableness. Young Christians are usually like young fruit, harsher, and sourer than the mellow fruits of holy ripeness, and experienced age. Who would think, that did read the Epistles of *John*, whom Jesus loved, breathing out *Love, Love, Love*, that this very man had three times offended Christ, by sinning against Love. First, by ambitious desiring to be above his fellows: Secondly, by offering to call for fire from Heaven against the refusers of Christ: Thirdly, by forbidding one to cast out Devils, (and do good) in Christs name, because he followed not with them, (like those that now would have some faulty men forbidden to Preach.) Love groweth as Grace groweth. If my confuting the Principles and Practices that are fitted to destroy Love, by Censures, Contempt, and unjust alienation be interpreted as contrary to Love, let the Censurers love so much the more, so it be Christians as such, and not a dividing Party only, and I have my end.

S E C T. 5.

A Comparison of the use of a faulty Translation of the Scripture, and a faulty Liturgy.

IN Queen Elizabeth's days the Bishoppes Translation of the Bible, and that called the Old one being faulty, were only in use. King James procured a better, but the Liturgy still remained, the Old one. Suppose a Law were made that only the Old faulty Translation be used; many refuse it, and suffer for it; the Parliament cometh and establishes the New Translation, and swear all men to promote it as a part of Reformation; we are in possession of it for fifteen years: then a Law is made that all shall go to Prison that use any but the Old; two thousand break this Law, and use the New, and suffer part of the penalty, and shift from the rest as long as they can. At last the State is resolved to suffer them no longer, but, in Prison they shall lie: Hereupon many suffer Imprisonment, many die there. Some few in London keep up secret Worship with the New Translation, and others go to the Churches where the Old is used. In the Countries there is not past one Minister in twelve or twenty Miles that keeps up a Meeting in the use of the New one. The few that yet do, say, that [to set the Old one, or new with such as do, is Cross-crossing, and false Worship, and unlawful, and a going back from Reformation.] Some that live in Countries where none in twenty Miles openly use the New one, come to R. B. for counsel; he desirith them to bring one of the contrary Judgment, and judge when they hear both: He tells them, that, 1. They should keep up the New Translation as far as they can in Gods Publick Worship, while the hurt will not be greater than the benefit. 2. That when they have no Publick Church or Worship to joyn with, but what useth the Old one, they should rather joyn with such than none: Also when they cannot have the New one without more hurt than benefit. 3. And that while they can have the New one, they should not renounce Communion with the Churches that use the Old one, as separating from it as unlawful, but only disown the faults of the Old one, while they disown not the Communion of the Churches in the use of it.

The other say, 1. That it is a cursed thing to offer God a worse, while we have better. 2. That we are sworn against it. 3. That it is false Worship, and obeying man before God. 4. That we do but keep our possestion, which they would pull us out of, and it's they that separate from us, and not we from them. 5. That we keep to Gods Word, which is the only Rule. And therefore Communion with the Old Translation is unlawful, and we should rather suffer death.

R. B. answereith, I. 1. That it is a cursed thing to give God no Publick Worship, because we cannot have the New Translation, and to live like Atheists if we cannot have what we would. Now is worse than the Old. Family Worship without Church Worship, is worse than an Old Translation. 2. And that it is not we that offer God the worse before the better; it is they that exclude the better, w hich we protest againt, having not our choice.

II. That he that swore to give over all Church Worship, unless he have the New Translation, swore wickedly like an Atheist; and he that swore to communicate with no Church that used the Old Translation, swore wickedly like a Schismatick; and he that swore that Gods Providence should never return him to a necessity of using the Old, swore blasphemously, as if he could have governed the World against God.

III. That all Worship is to far left as it is faulty; That to forsake all Publick Worship when we cannot have the better Translation, is to be righteous unrighteously, over much, and too little, and to disobey both God and man.

IVs. Keep your Polyglott as long as you can without more hurt than good. I am not one that ever strove to take it from you. But do you Brethren in Prison enjoy Publick Worship? You'll say,

say, they do better. It's easier bearing their Imprisonment, Poverty and Death, than your own. But what shall ten parts of the Kingdom do, that must have the Old Translation or none? You'll say, I suppose, *They may give over all Church Worship as impossible, and take up with Family Worship.* But stay, 1. Must you not first prove the Old so bad, as that no Church Worship is better? Have you proved this? 2. Will not your Reason prove, that we must also separate from you? Have not weak Ministers as bad faults as a weak Translation? 3. What's become then of your saying, *We had Possession?* Have they Possession of better that have *none at all?* Or, will you be *without all*, because you had *once Possession* of better? And will it excuse your ungodliness, that you can lay the blame on them that *dispossess* you? Or if they be Schismatics for so using you, doth it follow that you are none, if you persuade all to separate from all Gods Church Worship rather than joyn where the Old Translation is used.

V. Gods Word is the *Rule*; but only a general *Rule for words*, modes and circumstances. To love God and our Neighbour, and the Unity of the Church, are his greatest Commands. Go learn what these mean: To violate these, and forsake all Church Worship, if you cannot have the best Translation, is not to keep to the *Rule*, but most grossly to violate it in the greatest Commands against many Scripture Admonitions, which vehemently urge you to Love and Unity.

But, good friend, if really Christ and Scripture be your Guide, I desire no more; tell me, and lay by partiality; Did not Christ and his Apostles use both in the Synagogues, Church-Meetings, and Writings a faulty Translation of the Old Testament, and as bad as ours? Deny it if you can for shame. Though somerimes they varied, they mostly used the *Syriac*, according to which our faulty Translation of the Old Testament is made, as it differs from the Hebrew. Is this no Confutation of you? Yea, Christ and the Apostles used it the rather, because it was in common use. 2. And are you sure that among so many Greek differing Copies as we have of the New Testament, that you use and follow none but the best.

I would add a similitude, supposing that we had justt possession of the Publick Church-places & Tythes, & they are taken from us, & we can blame them that did it, and say over and over, *We had Possession, and therefore it is unlawful to meet in worse Rooms, for God must have the best;* will this hold when you cannot keep possession? Will you rather worship no where? This is no better than if you would tell all men, they should die rather than eat Brown Bread, if force take all other from them, because it is unjustly done, and they had possession of better. Good friends, keep your possession for me; but I own not the famishing of all that are dispossessed. If you do, I do not.

Obj. But this case is unlike to that of *Lyturgies*.

Answ. 1. The Scripture is Gods own Word: A mis-translation maketh that to be his word that is not; which sure is a tenderer matter than in what words we speak our own minds to God. Sure a depravation of Scripture is more than a Ceremony: Were Lyturgies such an alteration of Gods own words, you would more plausibly accuse them. One that said, God said this or that, which he said not, was worse than one that spake his own words undecently to God. To say, this is Gods word, which is not, is indeed adding to it; but so it is not to speak words as our own. How much the *Septuagint* differs from the Hebrew, how many Verses it leaveth out, how many additions and alterations it maketh, is commonly known. Christs and the Apostles use of this, was no approbation of its faults, much less their presence in the Synagogues, when others read *Aramaic* and the Prophets in them. And the *Psalms* in the *Syriac* Translation were part of their Lyturgy. For man to speak faultily is no wonder: It hath a more plausible pretence for Separation, to say that men corrupt the word of God. And yet when it is but such an Effect of Humane Imperfection, it is no just pretence. But

But yet a word more; Q. 1. Do you think that the Pharisees and Scribes had so much of the gift of Extempore Prayer, that they could, and did use to make long Prayers, as if it were by the Spirit Extempore? Saith, and you will disgrace the Doctor Arguments, that lay so much on this manner of praying. No doubt but it was Forms and Liturgies that they used; yet when Christ condemned them for praying in the streets to be seen, and using long prayer for a pretence to devour Widows houses; Q. 2. Did Christ speak one word against them as *Forms or Liturgies*? Did he want Zeal or Knowledge? Q. 3. Had they not been good in themselves, what else could they have made for so great evil? Q. 4. Did Christ or his Apostles ever forbear the Synagogues for the sake of these long Liturgies? Come friends, there is no end, nor much hope in disputing against fixed prejudice, and wrong confident Concessis, how clear soever the Light be against it. Hold your Judgment, and I shall hold mine, till God irresistibly reconcile us; and if you cannot forgive me, I can forgive you, but not own the guilt of your mistakes, and the Effects. I have too much already of my own, I had rather you accused me, than Confidence, for wilful contradicting any more. The Lord save us from our Enemies, but more especially from our Friends, and all their Temptations, and above all, from our selves.

It amazeth me to hear wile and godly men say, [It is Popery that is coming in upon us; Ergo, Let us all forsake the Parish-Churches, Quasi dic. The Enemy will take the City within these few years; Ergo, Let us all go out of it to day. Like him that killed himself for fear of dying some years hence. Dementation goeth before Perdition. Who knoweth not that the Religion of the Parish-Churches is like to be the National Religion? And shall we persuade Protestants to leave them all? Passion provoked by some mens baseness, hath too much conquered Love to Conformists in some mens minds, so that they scruple not too uncharitable opinions and words of them. This is contrary to Christian Love. I doubt not but there are hundreds of godly Conformable Ministers in England, On Aug. 24, 1662. Seven thousand or more did Conform, that had been kept in, in the Parliaments time; were all those seven thousand tolerable the year before, and ungodly the next year? Many Conformists now in London were taken for very good men in 1659. At once the other extreme, most study to get them out, and shall we also call all men on pain of hazarding their Souls to forsake them? A very great Church-man above 40 years ago was heard say to his Brethren; *The Non-conformable Puritans are Snakes: We have the Law against them, and cast them down when we will: But, it is the Conformable Puritan that is the Drivel of England, to be cast out:* And shall we second this, and that as in opposition to it? Grace is lost as far as Christian impartial Love is lost. And they that lose Religion themselves, which lyeth in Love, are like to be no good Keepers of it in the Church. If a good Man that we value become a danger to the truth, we are angry if his Errour be but contradicted, lest his Name be blemished: But some dare say the Conformists are all false, ready to betray the Church to Papists: who nowdo far more to keep them out then we do. This is against Jam. 3. 17. If there be any such Conformists high or low, I am none of their Advocate; God will find them out, and judge them: But I am confident that it is also Conformists (by the advantage of their Possession) that will do more to stop their desired success, than Nonconformists can do. I am sure Bishop Frost, Usher, Morton, Hall, Downham, Davenant, &c. were far from Popery. And what man living hath written stronger against it, than Dr. Isaac Barrow, (against whose Book a Doctor hath newly dash'd his Reputation, as a bubble against a Rock: And what the Bishop of Llandaff, the Bishop of Hereford, Dr. Peter Martin, Dr. Stillingfleet, and many more have done, is known.

Your Mr. Mrs. Mead once commended a Conformist for a Benefice to me, with these words, [Itake him to be the holiest Men I know,] I have loved him the better ever since for his Candor, Charity, and Impartiality.

S E C T. 6.

An Expository Advertisement about naming faulty Persons:

AS all men ought to have a just regard of their own and their neighbours reputations; so the over-much tenderness of the guilty and the proud, doth make it a matter of much difficulty; for an impartial man to know whether, and when he should name, or make known the persons whom he doth oppose or blame: Though the resolution seeme easie both to them, that have no charity to caution them, and to them that will do no duty that displeaseth others.

Being called to review my own practice, in this I shall give the World an account; First, of my Judgment in it, and then of my doings.

I take such a nomination to be a duty in these cases following.

1. In case of necessary defence of the Truth, against some dangerous Errors of some men otherwise pious and tolerable, the greatest Pillars of the Church have usually named them. I hope all those *Judaizers* that *Paul* so sharply writeth against, were not in a state of damnation: Doubtless *Peter* and *Barnabas*, were not, *Gal. 2.* nor I hope *Demas*, nor all the rest that he saith were not like-minded to *Timothy*, but sought their own, and not the things of Jesus Christ. And I hope the like of *Diotrichus*, much more assuredly of *Paul*, that blamed him, though that beloved Disciple is thrice named as culpable (seeking to be greatest, and offering to call for Fire from Heaven, and forbidding one to do Miracles in Christ's Name.) And *Peter* oft, and once tremendously (*Math. 16.*) rebuk'd by Christ. The sons of *Nash* and his Sons, *Liz* and his Wife and Daughters, *Sarah*, *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Jacob* and his Sons, *Moses*, *Aaron*, *Miriam*, many Judges, *Eli*, *David*, *Solomon*, *Rehoboam*, *Asa*, *Hzekiah*, *Josiah*, and many more, are left on Record in Scripture, with their names, by him who is LOVE it self, and hateth uncharitableness.

And though we believe not all that *Bernard*, *Walaf*, *Strab*, and such others, though good men, believed of *Peter Bruis*, *Henricus*, and other *Albigenses*, *Waldenses* and *Behrinius*, much less all that *Tho. Woldensis* saith against *Wickliff*, the wisest Reformers have seen cause to mention some of their mistakes.

Luthers first mistakes while he disowned not the Papacy, and his after sharpnes against *Cerelius*, and *Zwinglius*, are recorded by many that dislike them, as he recordeth his disastes of those aforesaid, and many more whom he disented from. All that are contradicted by name are not taken by sober men to be graceless, or intollerable. *Zwinglius* was a man of honour, and his Character was, that he had [an honest heart, but not a regulated head;] and yet the generality of Reformers cryed down his Errors and Sects. The *Calvinists* write for Communion with the *Lutherans*, and the Moderate *Lutherans* love the *Calvinists*, & yet they write against each other by name, as too many Volumes openly shew. *George Major* was a wise and good man, though *Schlusselburgius*, and such others, number him and his followers as Hereticks, as *Calvinus* doth the *Calixtines*. *Nicholas Gallus*, and *Amatus*, were noted Divines and Century Writers; though they so used *Major*, and maintained that *Good works are not necessary to Salvation*; for which wiser men did write against them. *Mat. Flac. Illyricus* (the chief Century Writer) was a Learned, Zealous Protestant, and yet many more than *Melanthon* and *Bora* have left as a blot upon his name, that he was so fierce against Ceremonies, and unpeaceable, and that he maintained that Original Sin is the substance of the Soul. *Andrew Osiander* was a very Learned Protestant, high in favour with his Prince, yet he and all his followers greatly opposed by the Orthodox Reformers, for maintaining that we are justified by Gods Essential Righteounenes made ours. And *Frixius* spied the worse for following him (though it was for State Councils that he died.) How high a Character doth *Melanthon*, and many other the greatest Divines give of *Hubertus Languetus*, as an Honourable, Learned, Pious, Excellent Man; and yet it's now scarce denied, but it was

was fit that wrote *Jerome Babes* (though it was long fully charged on Reg. and the Noble Sir Piffis.) Doubtless *Cassander*, *Erasmus*, *Wicilie*, and *Grosier*, were men of great worth, than yet for peace owned the *Roman Church* and Corruption; so far as is not to be inferred or overlook. All the *German* Prophets or Fanatics that *Chr. Beelzebub Exorcisms* name, and copiously confuse, were not ungodly or intolerable men. Whatever the *Pascallus*, *Wyclif*, and many of the rest were, I know not; butsure *Theodorus* was a godly man; and *Grosier* commended *Jhesus Christus* and his followers as men of piety and peace: and notwithstanding his vain affected words, *Jacob Babes* seemed a pious man; and I lost many of his chief Followers in *England*, of my acquaintance, because their Spirit and Writings were all for Love and Peace, (and their difficult Gibberish made me fearless of their multiplying, or ever doing any great hurt.)

And the Papists quite out-do us in arguing their Opponents, and their Errors, and yet not renouncing Communion with them, but keeping them in the bosom of their Church; as whole loads of Books written by the Schoolmen, and several Sects and Orders against each other shew: And specially the Controversies between the Seculars and Regulars, sharply handled by *Watkin*, in his *Quodlibets*; and divers others: And newly *Peter Walp*, that calls himself *Vulgaris*, and *Scribentis*, and his *Watkins* Controversies tell us more. But none more than the *Jesuits* and *Jansenists*: did we differ about half as many and weighty points as are recited in the *Jesuits Moralis*, and their Charge against the *Jansenists*, we should scarce think each other fit to be Members of one Communion.

And naming Opponents is oft necessary to make the Reader know what Books we write against for distinction sake.

2. And there is yet another great cause of naming faulty men, both (otherwise) godly and heretical. The Duty of a Publick or National Repentance oft requireth the mention of publick sin and sinners; (especially if they be our own) God long forbore to shew the publick National sins of Ancestors, to see if posterity, (who are the same Nation, though not the same Persons) will prevent his Judgments by Repentance: In which case they must confess their own, and their Fore-Fathers sins. This was the due penitence of the Church of Old, as *Exod. 32. &c. 107.* and many other shew; and the prayers of *Ezra*, *Daniel*, and others: they named many, and bewailed more of their National and Fore-Fathers sins; and if they do not, Christ will name them for them, as he did the blood-shed from *Abels* till *Zacharias*, and will revenge all together on the Impenitent Generation *Math. 23.* It was not to call dead men to Repentance, that all the fore-mentioned faults of good and bad men are recorded in the Scripture: But it is partly for the exercise of National Repentance, and partly for a warning to the living, that good mens names tempe them not to sin. Yea that shaming them is a mercy to us all to this day. Is evident, in that where God rewardeth any sin, without laying some reproach upon it, Satan maketh a snare of it, to persuade us it is no sin. What abundance have been emboldened to Lie, because the Midwives in *Egypt*, and *Davids* Lies are recorded without adjoyned reproof. Polygamy is pleaded for as lawful by that reason; and the Jews did so by Divorce; and some by drinking to excess, or overthrow of reason: All of us take it for a duty to bewail the Nations resistance of Reformation, and cruelty to the Martyrs in Q. *May's* days, and such like as part of our National Humiliation.

3. When pernicious Deceivers endanger the Church, by their Sophistry and Reputation, especially by publick Writings which survive them. God hath named in Scripture *Simeon Magor* and *Elymas*, and the Party called *Nicolaian*, whom his Soul hated, and largely described many throughout the New Testament, especially Epist. to *Gal. Col. 2 Pt. 2. Jud. Rev. 2. & 3.* And all that were faithful to the true Faith did of old name with detestation the *Ebisites*, *Cosmopolites*, *Onophriches*, *Palmyrenes*, *Basilidians*, *Marcionites*, *Priestlings*, and *Arians*, *Sabellians*, *Paulinists*, &c. And since the Reformation, the soberest Reformers named with zealous remonstrance the names of not only such as *Cesar Vanias*, and *Papa Clemens*, *Valent. Gentili*, *Servetus* (whom they burnt); but also those Capons of Sedition, that were the Heads of dangerous Sects: *Tho. Mowers* case they commonly mention with detestation; and *Jesu of Lyones*, and the rest at *Amstel* as worse. (And yet *Lis Jada* tells us with what marvellous constancy *Kappenberg* endured his flesh to be pulled off by pieces with red hot Pincers, scarce groaning or expressing grief.) The case

of *David George*, the Father of the *Liberians* (as *Browne* calls him) and *Henry Nicoll's* (the Father of the *Familists*) multitudes recite with detestation.

II. But there are many things that stand up against this duty, and turn men from it, or make it doubtful in particular instances.

1. One is the great abuse of it by the Antients, and the mischiefs done by that abuse. It calleth for greatest grief to read it, and to feel the fruit of it to this day, which while I have recited out of the Councils and Church-History, many cannot bear it. The case of the *Easter Contention* in all the Christian World, even in *Britaine* tell us: The shameful Catalogue of Heretics in *Philadephia*, yea many in *Epiphany* tell it us: So do the Controversies with the *Andrians*, *Novatians*, *Donatists*, the *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, *Moschelites*, the *tria Capitula* out of *Theodrite*, *Theodore Moys*, and *Ibas*: the Image Controversies, the *Corruption*, and *Phantasts*, and many more such: And since the heat of the *Lutherans*, (such as *Marthianus*, *Hesychius*, *Westphalus*, *Gallus*, *Ambrofius*, and lately *Calvinus*, and many still) against the *Catholicks*: The over-violent usage of the Remonstrants in *Holland*, the strife at the City of *Fraskford*, between the Conformists, and Nonconformists; the Violences, and Reproaches of Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independants, Erastians, and Anabaptists against each other in *England*, with the evil means, and long continuance, and woful effects. The *Scots* Covenants excluding from their publick Union there and here, all the *Diocesan* Divines and Party, even such as *Usher*, *Morton*, *Hall*, *Davenant*, &c. These great abuses of over-doers, and dividers, make many charitable men think, that it is best to mention no mens faults at all, save utter Enemies.

2. And another grand difflutive, is the certain abuse that bad men will make of it: Maligant Spit-fires do already write books full of palpable Lies against other men (of which I have had a notable part:) And in common speech and reproach, make many that they converse with, believe these lies? And if we call each other to Repentance, or confess our own sin, impudent Malice will turn it to a common scorn, and say, they are all alike, and worse than they confess.

3. And another hinderance is, that we think controverted Cases are not matter of *Censure*: And these are Controversies.

4. But the greatest impediment of all, is the *Natural filthiness*, *Pride* and *Impatience* that is in all, so far as they are unmortified, and unhumbled, and interesting God and his Truth, and Cause, more deeply than is just, in the interest of our selves, our Parties, and our Opinions.

To these four Cases I briefly say, 1. The avoiding of the contrary extreme, hindered not God and good men from mentioning *Diatribes*, *Damas*, the *Nicolaianos*, and all aforesaid.

2. If we shall omit all duty that men will abuse, we shall do none, or next to none. Repentance is most honourable, except Innocency: And they would reproach men less, if they more confess their sin themselves: And a true Confession is a true description of the Case, and shanmeth them that make it worse when it is, or lay the fault of the Guilty on the Innocent.

3. What Heresy or sin almost is not controverted? Satan will make a Controversy of all, if that shall serve: *Arrianism* is a sad instance, and *Sacramentism*, which is much worse, and *Popery* is more disputed for than they all.

4. God hateth the Proud, and will abase them, and pardoneth none but the Penitent, and he that finnily sauerth his Credit, shall most hole it: Repentance is a great, hard, necessary work, we can easily call other men to repent.

III. Having told you my judgment, I will as this worthy Brother adviseth, yet further review my own actions.

I am one of those that have formerly imitated *Austin* in some Confessions, and Retractions; but I cannot make every scornful expectants Opinion my measure, nor retract all that every extream'd Opposer, or Dissenter doth dislike. And I am one that long, and very dearly endeavoured to have prevented those *Overturings*, which I bewail: and at that time I thought them a sin so great, as I will not now describe, and took in the prognostick of their Consequents, in which I have only been thus far mistaken, that Gods wonderful mercy hath hitherto made them much easier then I expected: I mentioned them most openly and plainly then, to convince the Guilty, and save the Tempted; and I have oft since made some mention of them, not to call the

the dead to Repentance, but the Societies in their humiliations, and the Nation, and to preserve the living from the guilt of participation, and imitation. But I find that some much mislead me, and think that all the Persons that I have named, I mention as intolerable, or make them worse than they are, and equal the better with the worse, yea, make the Welsh Irascents worse than ignorant, vicious, mere readers. All this is far from my words and thoughts.

When *Clement Weller* wrote two Books against the Scripture, the Ministry, and me, I answered him modestly in my Book, called, *The Antecedents of Infidelity*: The Ramers I detested: The Quakers, when they bitterly reviled me, I gave free leave to dispute with me in my Congregation as long as they would: The Seekers, that said, Scripture, Church Ministry, and Sacraments were all lost, till new Miracles restored them, I dealt with peaceably: But I confess I took all these for such as were as unfit for my Communion, as they thought me for theirs, and mischievous to the Souls of Men. But I never thought of as equal with these the Persons that I then wrote against, as *Antinomians*, nor those that I now name on such accounts. I know that the *Liberians* Opinions called *Antinomianism*, by too near consequence subvert the Gospel. But I believe that the good men did not see such Consequences, but believed the fundamentals, wh ch they so subverted, and erred through ignorance, and unskillfulness, and confusion in managing Disputes, and zeal for Free-Grace, drew them in the dark to injure, and dis honour it: These erroneous Men, for ought I know, might love God through Christ more than I; and if so, they were so much better men than I. *Anxious* faith that Theology is so connect, that every Error by consequence overthroweth the foundation: If that be so, who is not guilty of it? I write here against no man as *Episcopal*, *Presbyterian*, *Independent*, *Erasian*, or *Anteapostol*: but only against hating one another on such accounts, and doing those things by alienation, excommunication, opposition, or other aversion unnecessarily, which signify detestation, or want of Love, or tend thereto.

As to the men named by me, take not the knowledge of their Opinions from me, but from their publick Books: Mr. *Ebury*, Prince, *Lilburn*, and such others have spoken too loud by the Press: I think much better of Mr. *Saltmarsh*, *W. Sedgwick*, *Drs. Hobson*, &c. and yet better of Mr. *Powell*, *Cradock*, *Lloyd*, whom I named, whom you may know in print: [The last, by a Dialogue between *Martha* and *Lazarus*, about his Soul, and Letters to Mr. *Ebury*.]

That which I say of such, I fully believe; that is, 1. That the Dr. greatly mistakes in his imitations, as if *Lynguries* had been the only cause, or at least greater than they were, of a defective Ministry, when so many of its greatest Adversaries have been so faulty, and defective.

2. Because those Errors may be dangerous to the hearers, which God forgiveth to the ignorant speaker, I assert, that found Doctrine read out of Notes or Books, is less hurtful to the Hearers, than dangerous practical Error delivered with fluent extempore fervency, and that when *Calvin*, *Hilderbrand*, and such great, and holy men, prayed usually in the Pulpit, by a Form, they failed not of the Spirits help, so much as they that extempore pray erroneously. And that Mr. *Phil. Nye* spake not mistakingly, when (to me), he wish'd that the publick *Congregations* in Wales had good Sermons books read to them, (though men should call them Homelies in contempt); not to put down Preaching, but where it's wanting: And that a very excellent Ministry beyond Sea, use publick *Lynguries*, and Pulpit Forms: And, excellent Holy Men in England long used the English *Lyngury*, from whom I never would have separated; even such A. *Eliot*, and *Bishops*, as *Granton*, *Patten*, *Grindal*, *Abbot*, *Usher*, &c. *Ridley*, *Hopper*, *Farrar*, *Jewell*, &c. such holy Teachers as *Bacon*, *Whately*, *Preston*, *Sibbes*, *Crocker*, *Bifield*, and abundance like them; Men of such rare Learning and Piety, as *Davenant*, *Gataker*, *Stoughton*, *Bishop Miles Smith*, *Dr. Field*, &c. And I do not believe that the *Westminster Assembly* were all, save eight Ministers, void of the Spirit, or unfit for Communion, while they used the *Lyngury*: Nor yet that of the 9000 that were in the publick Churches in 1659, or 1660, the 7000 that Confirmed p. 148. 24. 1662, were suddenly made insufficient, if they were sufficient before, (though I meddle not with the question, whether they did well). And yet against the contrary extreme, I say, if many thousands be put in Heaven, whom *Bishops* have Excommunicated, and thought impudent, yea, whom great Councils have called Heretics, wo to those *Bishops* that are worse than they.

I conclude with thanks to my Reverend Monitor, and tell him, that I would fain (whose Censure soever I undergo,) avoid both their sin, who undervalue mens Piety for miserable Errours, & condemn those that are better than themselves, (& themselves by consequence much more;) and theirs who in honour of good mens names, execute their dangerous errours, and practices, and hinder publick Repentance, forgiveness, and deliverance, by hiding, or smooching over publick sins. But being my self liable to forgetfulness, when I remember what answer a false Argument calls for, and what notice young people need for their preservation, I am sometime less sensible of the impatience of the partial, and mistaken, and how much harder it is to bear blame, then to deserve it, and how ill the effects of their impatience may be. Therefore while I stand to the Rule that he mentioneth, if I have by ignorance, hast, or any other Caufe, done that by naming, or confirming any, which hath truly a greater tendency to do hurt, than to do good, I repeat of all that's so said and done, and ask forgiveness of God and Man.

And if any be unhumbled for the publick sins of the Land, or any Party of their Minds, which have dishonoured God and our Religion, and hardened Adveraries, and brought us all into distres, and threaten yet worse to all the Land, and our Posterity, the Lord humble them before it be too late.

And if any that are far worse then themselves, take advantage from any mens Errours, Misdoings, or Confessions, to feed their own, and others malice, to reproach Piety, to oppret, or caluminate the Innocent, and lay the faults of a few that got military advantages, upon them that were furthest from the guilt, yea, on the Nation, and the Protestant Caufe, the day is at hand, that God will vindicate the just, and stop the mouths of false Accusers, with as great severity at least, as we can well desire. And delay is no violation of his promise: Though he stay long, he will avenge them speedily, *Luke 18.* And he knoweth that their day is coming: And then we shall say, it was the fittest time.

POST-SCRIP-T.

Reader, the sight of a Book of one Mr. *Edw. Petit*, called, *Visions of Government*, calls me to tell you, that all his reviling language needs no reply, or confutation: But his story about Major *Jennings*, how I stood by while he was wounded, and encouraged it, and took the Meddal from about his neck, is already by me confuted before my *Defense of the History of Council*: which I have made known to Mr. *L'Estrange*, and Major *Jennings*. And though the Rector of *Burton*, in the Life of Dr. *Hyllis*, publish it with Major *Jennings* affirmation, I do here again, as in the presence of God, take a voluntary Oath, that it is false; and that I was not near him at that time, nor never saw the man in my life, (unless I might see a man unknowingly in a Congregation, or distant crowd, nor did I see any wound him, nor take any Meddal of him: But that in the house where I was, I heard the Soldiers tell how they wounded, stripe him, and took his Meddal (laughing at a silly Soldier that called it a Crucifix:) And the man that took it, offering it to Sale, I gave him eighteen pence for it, and some years after sent it Major *Jennings* freely; which it seems made him think, and rashly affirm falsely, that it was I that took it from him. As for the rest of the Diabolism of that Book, and his, and others unceasane charges from one Book retracted so many years ago, and accused by my self, confessing to the *Oxford* men that burnt it, it doth but tell the world, what furious, implacable wrath in the engaged Enemies of Love and Peace can do, and sheweth it self more effectually then any other can. (As doth these others that have taken the like course.)